

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Vol. XXIII, 3.

WHOLE No. 91.

I.—PROBLEMS IN GREEK SYNTAX.

III.

From moods and modal particles we pass over to the tenses and consider first those temporal relations that are common to all the moods, the so-called *status actionis* or kind of time, that which makes *δίδου* to differ from *δός*, *ἦν διδῶ* from *ἦν δῶ*, *διδούης* from *δοίης*, *διδόναι* from *δοῦναι*, *διδούς* from *δούς*, as well as *εἰδόμεν* from *ἴδομεν*. For these are the universal relations and, which is especially important, these were the relations to which the Greeks were sensitive from the beginning to the end, so sensitive that experienced Grecians have acknowledged their inferiority in this regard to the poorest *Graeculi*.¹ What the original scheme of the tenses was need not trouble us here. The categories of past, present and future to which we cling despite our own language, which has no future, these categories are not vital. Out of durative or

¹ Blass, G. N. T. G., § 57, 'This distinction is observed in the N. T. with the same accuracy as in classical Greek.' Cf. A. J. P. XI 107. On the other hand, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lesebuch*, Erl., p. 215, says: Der Unterschied zwischen den Imperativen des Praesens und des Aorists wird in der vulgären Rede vernachlässigt. On the domination of the aor. imper. in certain spheres see my remarks on Justin Martyr, *Apol.* I 16, 6. Doubtless the problem is often a very delicate one, as in Eur. Hipp. 473: ἀλλ' ὦ φίλη παῖ, λῆγε μὲν κακῶν φρενῶν, | λῆξον δ' ὑβρίζουσ'· οὐ γὰρ ἄλλο πλὴν ὑβρις | τὰδ' ἐστί. Is this change a mere matter of *metri causa*? Or, to use the consecrated formula, does *λῆγε* give a general and *λῆξον* a specific command, the specification being made by *ὑβρις τὰδ' ἐστί*, or does *λῆγε* connote impatience (S. C. G. § 405) as the aorist connotes urgency?

progressive, out of aoristic, ingressive, complexive, completed action, one can get by combination temporal relations enough to satisfy life.¹ And yet respectable scholars, more than respectable scholars, have slighted or sneered at the *status actionis* of the extra-indicative moods, and, whilst they accept and expand the traditional differences between ἔφευγον and ἔφυγον, pass over lightly or ignore the difference between φεύγειν and φυγεῖν. Of course, this is a sad inconsistency, because ἔφευγον differs from ἔφυγον only as φεύγειν differs from φυγεῖν. But, of late years, a disposition has been shown to efface this inconsistency also, and the differences between imperfect and aorist have been wiped out by various scholars, notably by one from whose native familiarity with two distinct preterites one would have expected a different attitude.² But the French *prétérit défini* is a book tense, and the French imperfect, while it helps us to understand the Greek imperfect, helps us also to misunderstand it. In fact, there are few domains in which national variations are so puzzling as in that of the tenses. With all the practice of long residence and all the advantages of hard study the foreigner bewrays himself by the tenses. This is true of the German in America, of the American in Germany. This was true of the Roman writer of Greek, and the use of the tenses is one of the marks by which the Latinizing writer of Greek is detected. Too many pluperfects, too few imperfects.³ But just now we are dealing not so much with the past-imperfect and the past-aorist as with the imperfect in general and the aorist in general, the progressive tenses and the aoristic tenses.⁴ True, the differences are often hard to translate, sometimes impossible of translation. But what concerns us here is the direct perception of the differences between such temporal relations, not the difficulty of rendering these differences into an alien tongue. We may resort to special periphrases, we may use auxiliary verbs to bring out the distinctions, we may even go as far as Curtius has done and make use of different verbs for different tenses, just as in Greek itself ἦλθον is the practical aorist of εἶμι and ἐπάταξα the practical aorist of τύπτω.

¹ See A. J. P. XXIII 106.

² Riemann in the *Mélanges Graux*, 585-598. See now Riemann and Goelzer, p. 250 and p. 832.

³ A. J. P. XIV 104; XVI 259.

⁴ For which I have recently proposed the terms 'paratatic' and 'apobatic', A. J. P. XXIII 106.

All that interests us here is the establishment of the fact of the feeling. Once the feeling was almost universally admitted, but objections have not been wanting. There is the *metri causa* argument, to show that the distinction, if any, is overborne by the march of the verse. There is the parallel passage argument, the argument that has been used triumphantly to show that there is no difference between this future and that future. If one admits that *metri causa* may suffice to efface slight differences; the inch of concession becomes an ell whereby to measure all Greek. If one attempts to show that two passages may have the same general meaning and yet a very different coloring, one cannot expect a patient hearing from those who think that it is very much the same thing whether you use two finite verbs or one finite verb and one participle.¹ But in spite of all cavil there are passages in which the Greek author himself makes a point that turns on the shift of the tenses, and to these we can look with confidence as proofs that the distinction is not dead. It is at most dormant. It can be roused to life whenever needed. And if this is so, the style of an author will be very different according as these modal tenses are always used sharply and clearly, or as he slurs distinctions which must have been national.

Not least interesting nor least convincing in this range of studies are the fixed formulae; for in these formulae we have the record of distinctions that must have been sharply marked to the early speakers of the language. What may seem subtle to us could not have been subtle, to begin with. Such a formula is the coincidence of the kind of time in *φθάνω* and its participle. It is a regular paradigm, *φθάνω ποιῶν*, *φθάνω* (hist. pres.) *ποίησας*, *φθήσομαι* *ποιήσας*, *ἔφθασα ποιήσας*, *παύ*—*ἔφθακα πεποιηκώς*. *φθάνω* and the participle are, if not absolutely faithful to each other, at least reasonably so through all generations of Greek. It is an example of conjugal fidelity worthy of all admiration.² The participle of *λανθάνω* is not so constant and the participle of *τυγχάνω* is as inconstant as *τύχη* herself.

In studying the tenses of a foreign language it is especially desirable to get rid of one's native ply; and yet, as it is impossible to get rid of it, the next best thing is to make allowances for it. So in studying the Greek present we must

¹ For Homeric examples see T. D. Seymour, Transactions of American Philological Association, XII 81.

² See A. J. P. XII 78-9.

remember that we have two familiar periphrases for the present for which the Greek has no exact parallels, the so-called progressive 'I am walking', which is not adequately rendered by βαδίζων εἰμι, and 'I do walk', which produces an impression akin to βαδίζω δή. We are prone, therefore, to analyze the Greek present as we are usually forced to analyze the Greek future, as we are forced to decide between the periphrastic 'shall' and 'will'. To the Greek the present was an indefinite tense. In familiar language it answered for present, it answered for past, it answered for future. It is universal: 'The sun rises in the East and sets in the West'. It is particular: 'The sun sets behind a cloud'. And this suffices. But we cannot help asking: Is it originally progressive or, if you choose, durative? Is it originally aoristic? Or, have we one set of forms that are progressive, one that are aoristic? Was there, for instance, the same difference between a long present form and a short present form that we feel between ἀγινέω and ἄγω? All that can be said with approximate confidence is that a typical difference having set itself up between imperfect and aorist in certain forms, the present associated itself with the imperfect and became by preference durative, by preference progressive. When, therefore, an aoristic present was needed, the aorist itself was employed. We who have learned to feel the augment as the sign of the past time may have our sensibilities shocked, but we have to unlearn that feeling; and in any case the fact is there, and it is impossible to explain all the uses of the aorist side by side with the present by a resort to the paradigmatic aorist or to the empiric aorist. It is an interesting phenomenon that the so-called gnomic aorist holds to its augment in Homer with a tenacity that is very strange in view of the fact that gnomic aorist and present are so often paralleled.¹ True, the paradigmatic aorist has its legitimate use in proverbs, which are largely abridged parables, abridged stories. A typical action is good for all time. The empiric aorist appeals to experience as the Preacher appeals to experience. 'The thing that hath been it is that which shall be; and that which is done is that which shall be done; and there is no new thing under the sun'. But the

¹ Platt, E. J. of Phil. XIX (1891): 'The general rule is that the gnomic aorist in old Epic poetry takes the augment. Exceptions are so few as to be practically non-existent'.

paradigmatic and the empiric explanations do not satisfy the feeling in passages in which the shift from present to aorist is clearly a shift from durative to complexive, from progress to finality, and it is just these passages that show how alive the Greek is to the kind of time.¹ If the Greek had used throughout his literature the historical present for the past, the aoristic feeling of the present might have been more pronounced, but the historical present, belonging as it does to the household stock, seems to have been tabooed as vulgar by the epic and the higher lyric.² There is not an example in Homer, and I have challenged all that have been cited in Pindar (I. E., cii). It was the drama, which is chiefly representative and not narrative, that ventured to bring it back. Once rehabilitated by the drama, it became common in prose and was used freely by historians and orators, not, however, without individual differences, which it might be worth while to scan more narrowly, but it was never, perhaps, employed so recklessly as among the Romans, who are sadly given to overdoing. In English the historical present is in like manner apt to be overdone by flashy writers, and is not unfrequently sought by those who wish to be lively at all hazards. The historical present is a well-known weakness of Dickens. As Augustine Birrell says, 'What can be drearier than when a plain, matter-of-fact writer attempts to be animated and tries to make his characters live by the futile but easy expedient of writing about them in the present tense?' As a future the present is used only in those verbs in which the will is the deed. There are very few. Nor does the present for the future show itself much in the Greek dependent sentence, whereas it reigns in idiomatic English. The Greek absolutely riots in futures of every shade and seldom calls on the *praesens propheticum*, which is reserved for solemn occasions. We are in the region of 'Burdens' and 'Warnings'. 'Behold, the Lord maketh the earth empty and maketh it waste and turneth it upside down'.

¹ The passages in my S. C. G. § 260 might have been multiplied, perhaps ought to have been multiplied. The aorist produces an effect of finality akin to the perfect, of which the aorist is often the shorthand. In S. C. G. § 257, which has been freely criticised, read, 'the gnomic perfect < is based > on experience < real or imaginary (vision) >'.

² See now S. C. G., § 200, and cf. Kellner, *Historical Outlines of English Syntax*, p. 229: 'The Historical Present is scarcely to be met with in Old English; but there are numerous instances of it from the thirteenth century down to our times. Frequent in Chaucer and Elizabethan writers'.

The Greek future is, for us, as has been intimated, an untranslatable tense. In every simple sentence we are obliged to differentiate and as the use of 'will' and 'shall' has varied greatly from the time of Shakespeare to our own days and still varies in different localities, the difficulty of rendering is greatly enhanced. But the translation should not be allowed to get between us and the Greek future. We encounter a like puzzle in every direction, we encounter it in the Latin future, in the Romance future, which no native analyzes into 'will' and 'shall'. In the leading clause the negative is *οὐ*, but in the dependent clause with the exception of the descriptive relative the negative is *μή*. In the one it is indicative, in the other it is, for want of a better word, imperative. Now according to Dr. Rutherford, who is a Scotchman, the future indicative in an *εἰ*-clause is to be translated by an emphatic 'will',¹ but I am not certain that I always understand a Scotchman's 'will'; and the American 'will' is not uniform. 'We will' for 'we shall' is exceedingly common over the whole country and is not a specifically Southern error, as has been charged: and even those who make the book difference between 'shall' and 'will' are apt to lean too much to 'shall' and others who manage to keep 'shall' and 'will' apart in statement are prone to fuse them in the question and in indirect discourse and, then again, those who are decent enough in the matter of 'shall' and 'will' are reckless in the matter of 'should' and 'would', to which the same principles apply. I should therefore prefer not to accept Dr. Rutherford's uniform translation of an emphatic 'will' for *εἰ* with future indicative and yet it is but fair to say that the 'shall' by which we are prone to render *εἰ* with future indicative in contradistinction to *ἐάν* with the subjunctive seems to be more formal, minatory, legal in its tone now than it was centuries ago. Let us, therefore, put translations aside for a while and say: It is enough if we associate the imperative idea with the *μή* future of the dependent clause. In the independent sentence there is no *μή* future. There the negative is *οὐ* and the so-called imperative future with *οὐ* is not an imperative but a familiar prediction, which involves either absolute control or foreknowledge absolute. It is the address to a slave, to a familiar, and all the mildness of its imperative use is the merest fancy. 'Thou shalt not steal' is not the rendering of the Greek *οὐ κλέψῃς*. The Hebrew has the negative of prediction. The command is addressed to the servant of the Most High.

¹ First Greek Syntax § 285.

The Greek future does not escape the question of its modality nor does it escape the question as to the kind of its time. Is it undifferentiated or does it lean toward progressive action on the one hand or toward complexive action on the other? The close resemblance in form—I waive all questions of origin here as elsewhere—the close resemblance in form to the first aorist subjunctive may have given it a ply in the aoristic direction and a remarkable indication of that is the steadiness of *φθάσω* (*φθήσομαι*) with the aorist participle, but whatever its natural affinities, the Greek prefers other expressions than the future indicative for more exact relations of future time. The future indicative has, it is true, established itself in the independent sentence but in the dependent sentence it is confined to a limited sphere from which it has not succeeded in ousting the more exact expressions of temporal relations such as *ὅταν* and *ἐπειδάν* with present and aorist subjunctive. It has not forced its way into temporal sentences of limit such as *ἕως ἄν* and *πρὶν ἄν*. *ἦν* with present and aorist subjunctive outnumbers *εἰ* with future indicative and the generic relative prefers *ὅς ἄν* with present and aorist subjunctive. Nay, even in the leading clause, the optative with *ἄν* disputes the territory with the future, and the positive future is balanced by the negative optative with *ἄν*. This desire for an exact future is characteristic of the language and gives rise to complicated periphrases, but nowhere is it shown more strikingly than in the exactness with which the comparatively late first future passive is used whenever there are two competing forms. In the *De Compositione* Dionysios bids us consider whether we shall use *ἀφαιρήσομαι* or *ἀφαιρεθήσομαι*,¹ but Dionysios is thinking of the rhythmical effect merely. The modern grammarian is thinking of the kind of time. *ἀφαιρήσομαι* is durative and may be compared with the verbs of depriving, *ἀφαιρεθήσομαι* is aoristic; and the conviction of the justice of this distinction caused Blass to revise his scheme of the tenses in the new edition of Kühner, as is well known.² We see then that the survival of the original modal sense of the future, the range of its employment as an imperative, the replacement of it by other moods, all these belong to aesthetic syntax as well as to every-day syntax: and so does the use of the future as a gnomic

¹ De comp. verb. 43 (R): καὶ ἀφαιρήσομαι ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀφαιρεθήσομαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα . . . μετασκευάζει τὰς λέξεις ἵν' αὐτῷ γένοιτο ἀρμοσθεῖσαι καλλίους καὶ ἐπιτηδεύτεραι.

² Cf. Teil I., Bd. II., S. 585 with Bd. I., §190.

tense, so does the traveller's future of Herodotos, by which the story-teller enters into confidential relations with his listener.

The future perfect has little range in Greek. It is a rare form. Grammarians tell us that it is not formed from pure verbs that begin with a vowel. If one chooses to consider *ᾠφελήσομαι* a future perfect what is there to prevent it? And the context might demand it. In its narrow range the future perfect has its full rights. There is no abatement of its force in *δεδήσομαι* or *πεπράσομαι* any more than there is an abatement in the force of the perfect imperative. *εἰρήσεται* has the same sphere as *εἰρήσθω*.¹ That the future perfect occurs chiefly in the dramatic poets is due not to the iambic metre at the close of the verse, as has been maintained. That is a mere coincidence of position with sense. Where else shall we look for finality if we are not to look for it in the future perfect and at the end of the verse? When Aias says: *τὰ . . . τεύχη κοῖν' ἐμοὶ τεθάψεται*, who would dare to write *ταφήσεται*, no matter how the metrical Moloch might smile with its iron jaws?

To the sphere of the present belongs the perfect. Everybody recognizes now that in the perfect form, as elsewhere, reduplication, has only to do with the character of the action, that we have to make a variety of classes, that we have to sunder f. i. the onomatopoetic perfect and the emotional perfect from the perfect of completion. And yet it is not so very many years since 'I have set up a yell and therefore am yelling' was gravely put forward as an explanation of the tense of *κέκραγα*. Few would venture nowadays to explain *τέτριγα* and *δέδια* as perfects of completed action. Verbs of perception, verbs of gesture have passed into the intensive category, not always with so clear a right. Of course the large use of such perfects is to be sought in the poetical sphere—which is the sphere of fancy and emotion and need not detain us—but a word as to the sphere of the ordinary perfect may not be amiss.

In practical life the perfect was much more frequently used than we might gather from a general survey of the literature; and in fact, the nearness of any department of literature to practical life may readily be measured by the perfect. The perfect belongs to the drama, to the orators, to the dialogues of Plato. The drama, to be sure, is under the thrall of verse and the perfect is a heavy form and suffers a replacement by the aorist; and yet it is of not infrequent occurrence. In history the perfect has no place outside

¹ See A. J. P. XVII 518 and S. C. G. § 279 foll.

of the speeches and the reflective passages in which the author has his say. One would hardly expect a dearth of perfects in an author like Polybios, head of the pragmatistical school of historians. Statistics are a bugbear to many, and perhaps the statistics of the perfect would not be profitable. In the absence of statistics, turn over the leaves of Veitch's Irregular Verbs and see in what authors perfects most do congregate. I have just alluded to the replacement of the perfect by the aorist, which, as I have said elsewhere, may be used as the shorthand of the perfect (A. J. P. XIV 105). The aorist has a strong affinity for the negative and we often find the tenses so associated that the negative thought is expressed by the aorist, the positive by the perfect. Then whole ranges of verbs form no perfect that we know of, and many of the perfects that figure in our grammars are due to the mechanical manufacture of an artificial period, to the desire of completing a paradigm such as gave birth to the various unrealities that were wont to figure under ΤΥΠΤΩ, though in view of the fact that even in the best period there are so many isolated perfects, we ought not to be too hasty in damning the *Graeculi*, whom it is so easy to damn.

In consideration, then, of all these cross-calculations it will be admitted that the stylistic study of the use of the perfect is a complicated problem and perhaps all that can be formulated with certainty is that the very large use of the perfect in any sphere shows too much analysis and is a mark of decline, and in later Greek suggests Roman influence—the same influence that manifests itself in an undue use of the pluperfect.

The three historical tenses were used with full consciousness by the Greeks of the best period, by the Greek of the period in which imagination and reflection held perfect balance; and the distinction between imperfect and aorist and the distinction between aorist and pluperfect play a large part in syntax and yet not too large a part. The formulae are too vague, the observations too superficial; too little attention has been paid to the sphere of usage, so that assaults on the traditional distinctions are not surprising. These assaults have had for their object mainly the levelling of imperfect and aorist; for the difference between aorist and pluperfect is too evident to be ignored. Indeed, if we study the passages in which the Greek makes a point on the shifting use of the three historical tenses, it does not readily appear how any student of the Greek language who has to deal with practical phenomena could allow a theory of origin

to interfere with the facts of usage. There might be room for carping when the three historical tenses as used in the same sentence come from different verbs, but what is to be done with the classic passage in Herodotos, in which the same verb is used, the tense shifting as if the historian were giving a lesson in grammar.¹ The difference thus made is the typical difference, which may be obscured here and there, which can never be effaced. Much has been made of a small and ancient group of verbs in which we have indifferent preterites—*ἦν, ἦα, ἔφην*—though even these are not indifferent throughout, and let us frankly say that for aught we know the group may have been much larger. Nay, it may be conceded that the whole difference between aorist and imperfect is in all likelihood the result of a gradual differentiation. *ἔτραπον* the aorist of one dialect is the imperfect of another. But the differentiation is there. Just as in another sphere we say that whatever *ἔστεφανώσατο* may have been in the beginning, it becomes rigidly middle, so it may safely be said that an imperfect in the classic language is never interchangeable with the aorist, though the shift from one to the other is often so subtle as to escape our analysis, and we have to resort to the imponderable category of 'feeling'. The best contrasted definitions do not avail throughout. We call the aorist the tense of statement, the imperfect the tense of description; we call the aorist the complexive tense, the imperfect the tense of evolution. We say that the aorist gives the sum, the imperfect the items. We say that the imperfect is the tense of actual vision, the tense of sympathy. The aorist appeals more to the intellect, the imperfect more to the eye. The aorist descends like lightning, the imperfect comes down like a pall. There is an aorist of eagerness, an imperfect of reluctance; and so on through a long array of metaphors. And yet a simple *ἔλεγε* where one might use *ἔειπε* drives Cobet to set up a peculiarity of the Ionic dialect, and his fine remark on the propriety of the imperfect for the *oculati testes*² (N. L. 409) is wasted on himself. *ἔπεμπον, ἐκέλευον, ἔλειπον* have evoked a variety of explanations.³ The artistic imperfect *ἔποιε* seems to have puzzled

¹ See now S. C. G., § 264.

² The aorist of eagerness is the so-called dramatic aorist which figures in all the grammars (S. C. G., § 262), but I did not have the heart to add another category to my exhibit of the imperfect in spite of my own note on Pindar, O. 6, 45: *ἔλειπε*, 'She had to leave'. Cf. Il. 19, 288, and Eur. H. F. 554, with the note of Wilamowitz.

the ancients themselves, and the almost sentimental explanation that we find in Pliny has been accepted with rapture and cited over and over again as an illustration of the modesty of the Greek artist, who lingered lovingly over his work and never counted himself to have attained, until some pitiless statistician found out that the early artists had no such sentimentality, and now the prosaic explanation which parallels *ἐποίησε* with *ἐτίκτε*, 'was the maker' with 'was the mother', has thrust out the other.¹ And yet the other may have been superinduced. The artists of modern times who have accepted Pliny's explanation, and have inscribed on their work *faciebat* in good faith, must have had partners in their error among the antique artists, for Pliny's contribution to the theory of the tenses was doubtless a tradition of the studio. Nay, even Pindar lends color to the tradition when he sings: αὐλῶν τεύχε (sc. παρθένος) πάμφωνον μέλος, where we see the Virgin Goddess fashioning the melody. But the aorist follows, εὔρεν θεός. (P. 12, 19.)

In the list of traditional differences between aorist and imperfect given above, the reader may miss the formulae of 'prolonged' and 'momentary' action. Few formulae have done more harm than these. Tense of duration, tense of momentum, would not be so objectionable, but, unfortunately, duration has to be explained and the seat of the duration put where it belongs, in the eye of the beholder, in the heart of the sympathizer, and not in the action itself. Describe a rapid action and you have the imperfect. Sum up a long action and you have the aorist. Definite numbers take the aorist with a fateful regularity, if there is no interruption to the series.² The negative takes the aorist as a rule, the imperfect only when there is something countervailing, something that has to be opposed, so that the negative with the imperfect often gets a modal translation, just as we say in English 'The door would not shut'. So in Latin the historical tenses of verbs of hindering are limited to the imperfect sequence. Hindering involves opposition to will, involves resistance to pressure.

¹ See S. C. G., § 213, footnote. Ulrich's remark occurs in his *Chrestomathia Pliniana*, Einleitung, XIV. Add Meisterhans³, p. 241.

² So in any kind of Greek that is Greek, Hebrews 3, 17: τίσιν δὲ προσέχθισεν τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη. The catena can easily be effected and in my *Syntax* § 244 I did not care to multiply examples, which any index that has numerals in it will increase indefinitely. Examples with the non-indicative moods, however, are not so common, and I am sorry that I did not cite Dem. 50, 39: τὸν ὑπὲρ σεαυτοῦ χρόνον τριηράρχησον-τῶς 25 μηνάς.

Much can be done in the way of observing the spheres in which the imperfect moves, the verbs that it prefers, and analysis has not exhausted its resources, though, of course, much will always be left to immediate feeling and Queen Grammar will lose her rights. In shifting from one language to another, one has to acquire a different set of tentacles. As a tense *ἔλεγε*, 'dicebat', 'disait', 'said', 'sagte' may be called by the same name and may have the same function and yet demand a different treatment. Our English imperfect has collapsed into an aorist, so much so that the progressive is used when we need certain phases of the imperfect, and yet the aoristic use of our imperfect is in need of reinforcement, and when we use the negative, which has affinities with the aorist, we use the reduplicated aorist 'did'. Nay, we Americans shocked the late Mr. Fitzedward Hall by going so far as to say 'did not have', which, I am ready to believe, is abominable. In South Germany the imperfect is less used; and in French the imperfect is used in a way that seems to be nearer to Greek than it is to Latin. There are no statistics to show what is the proportion of imperfect to aorist in Greek compared with the proportion of imperfect to historical perfect in Latin. It has been maintained of late on the basis of a very imperfect induction that the Roman did not use his imperfect so freely as did the Greek, and it is *a priori* very likely, but the conditions are so complicated that mere counting will not suffice. To plunge into Caesar's Gallic War and Xenophon's Anabasis and emerge with a bushel-basket of statistics will not serve. The spheres are not exactly the same, and oh! the difference of authors, apart from the nationality.¹ The large use of the imperfect in Greek may, however, well be considered a note of *naïveté*, but that note of *naïveté* is lost in the transfer to English, to German. The English progressive would be intolerable for any length of time and is excluded from a certain range of verbs. 'I was loving' of our paradigms is an impossibility. The German imperfect does not produce the same impression as the Greek imperfect, and as the South German is more *naïf* than the North German, one might have to substitute the perfect and save the tone at the expense of the tense. Here, then, on what some would consider the very threshold of the language, we meet a problem that is to be solved by sympathy and sympathy alone. The open sense of the student is the only open sesame.

¹A. J. P. XIV 105.

The pluperfect, which figures so largely in Latin, has a much more modest rôle in Greek. It is made up in very much the same way, but it is a relatively heavier form, and the notion of antecedence in the past which gives the Latin pluperfect so wide a scope is jauntily borne in Greek by the aorist. The aorist is not so exact as it might be; but the Greeks were satisfied with a hint. The Greek pluperfect is to the imperfect what the perfect is to the present. It hunts in couples with the imperfect and aorist, and should be studied in connexion with its comrades. But it is a lumbering tense and requires more analysis of the situation than the Greeks were disposed to wait for. Hence there is no more suspicious circumstance in later Greek than the abounding use of the pluperfect; and the multiplication of the pluperfect in Babrius gives the effect of a translation from the Latin, though even that does not avail to destroy the charm.

THE COMPOUND SENTENCE.

We now pass from the domain of the simple sentence to that of the compound sentence, from the combination of words to the combination of sentences, now in parataxis, now in hypotaxis. In the older grammars parataxis received scant notice. A few remarks on the copulative, adversative, causal and illative conjunctions, and then the attention was concentrated chiefly on hypotaxis with its more complicated phenomena. Nowadays parataxis is looked upon as the key to hypotaxis. All subordination is traced to co-ordination and the first question in regard to every hypotactic phenomenon is: How did it originate in parataxis? The value of the method is undoubted, and it is true that many of the most difficult problems in the syntax of the sentence find their ultimate explanation in the original parataxis. But no sooner was the key found than it was forced into locks which it could by no means be made to fit, and warning voices were not long in making themselves heard, Brugmann's most emphatically (A. J. P. IV 418, 419). The processes of the lover of language ought not to be brutal.

τὸν δὲ Κένταυρος ζαμενής, ἀγανὰ χλαρὸν γελάσσας ὄφρ' αὖ, μήτιν ἴαν
εὐθὺς ἀμείβετο· Κρυπταὶ κλαῖδες ἐντὶ σοφᾶς Πειθοῦς ἱερᾶν φιλοτάτων.

Pyth. 9, 38.

Analysis must imitate the coaxing process of synthesis. Valuable as it is in enabling us to understand origins, the paratactic formula

rudely applied has wrought positive mischief. We must not insist on forcing it to the front, we must not insist on feeling it under formulae that were established as formulae, that had established other formulae long before our record. 'Do ye not know that the saints shall judge the world?' (I Cor. 6, 1), may be analyzed thus: 'The saints shall judge the world'—'do you not know that?' but analysis fails to reproduce the effect of the synthesis—fails to explain the synthesis. The change of order alone is fatal to such a genesis. The matter is not so simple as it seems. And so in Greek, as Brugmann has pointed out, while certain sentences may be explained paratactically they are not felt paratactically. True, we never lose the negative feeling of μή, the conflict of negatives in μή οὐ, and *ut* after a Latin verb of fear has a way of its own with it¹ and is not felt as an equivalent of *ne non*. There is therefore a manner of survival of parataxis in sentences of fear, though only a manner of survival; but the final sentence which ultimately belongs to the same group had passed into the stage of formula before our record. Emotion may revive the original parataxis with verbs of fear. Purpose is too closely welded to permit the revival of parataxis. The final sentence is ultimately an imperative sentence and we should expect the tenses to run on the same lines as the imperative tenses, but with all the work Weber has done on the final sentence, this is a point that he has not wrought out and it is worth working out. But however that may be, the shifting conjunctions color the finality somewhat. The Homeric ὡς is 'how', and so is ὅπως, and we feel *κεν* when it attaches itself to these, we feel *αν*. In

ἀλλ' ἴθι, μή μ' ἐρέθιζε, σωώτερος ὥς κε νήγαι

the little *κε* is heard amid the outburst of rage; the subtle touch is lost in *oratio obliqua*. In Plato's prose rendering we have simply the optative: ἀπιέναι δ' ἐκέλευε καὶ μή ἐρεθίζειν ἵνα σὺς οἴκαδε ἔλθοι.² ὅφρα 'until' is dying as 'until'. In the Odyssey it is largely 'in order that'. In Pindar it is only 'in order that', in fact, is nothing more than a bit of poetical obsolescence, and the 'in order that' of ἵνα is as early as the time of Homer dissociated from the 'where' of ἵνα, which survives only in out-of-the-way corners of speech until the artificial writers of late centuries fished it up as Attic and made it do duty as 'where' at the same time that they

¹ A. J. P. VI 84.

² Rpb. 393 E.

rehabilitated $\omega\varsigma$. How far the final sentence had become formula, how far it was going on the way already traversed by the other final, the infinitive, we can see by the occasional use of a final sentence as a complementary sentence of design¹ such as are familiar in Latin, *impero ut* and the like. But by one of those pudencies to which language is subject, the process did not go forward along the whole line and, while we find such constructions with the semi-final conjunctions $\omega\varsigma$ and $\delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ even in the best period, the shamelessness of $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ and the subjunctive does not become rampant until a late period, until in fact the Orontes had disembogued into the Tiber as the Tiber had absorbed the Ilissus. In the modern language the infinitive has disappeared and $\iota\upsilon\alpha$ with the subjunctive reigns in its stead.

It is clear, then, that if we find the reign of formula in the dependent sentence so well established from the beginning of our record as to anticipate the corruption of later times, it is idle to lay too much stress on primitive conditions. And yet the primitive conditions are not to be neglected especially when they survive in languages to which we can apply the test of direct appreciation, and for the evolution of the subordinate clause our own language gives us unusual opportunities. In the whole matter of the genesis of dependent sentences, the relative plays an important part and for the state of things that preceded the relative we have valuable survivals in English. For like the English stock, the English language has retained much that is primitive and few cultured languages show more clearly the process of growth. The Cyclopean structure of the sentence is found more familiarly in English than elsewhere and we go back to a period that antedates the relative. 'The man I saw', 'I fear he knows', 'I hope he sees', which run trippingly off our tongues, would be strange in other languages. In Shakespeare's time the freedom was much greater. Now we limit the usage to the objective relatives proper but, as it is, the bounds are wide enough to make a foreigner stare. 'The man that I saw', 'the man which I saw' 'the man whom I saw' represent different states and stages. 'The man I saw' is primal.²

Now the relative owes its main binding force to its position at the head of a sentence. To use Greek terminology, it would not have become an $\alpha\rho\theta\rho\omicron\nu$ $\upsilon\pi\omicron\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu$, if it had not been so

¹ See Monro, H. G. § 286.

² See Kellner l. c. § 109.

decidedly an ἀρθρον προτακτικόν. The demonstrative οὗτος at the head of a sentence has exactly the same office, and we cannot speak of asyndeton when οὗτος is employed with reference to what precedes. It is the antecedent as we call it, the correlative of the relative, οὗτος—ὅς, ὅς—οὗτος.

From sentences thus connected by ἀναφορά arises what is called hypotaxis, what is called subordination. It is younger, we say, less primitive than co-ordination and absence of it gives simplicity, gives *naïveté* to style. And yet so old is it that some familiar forms of parataxis might be classed as hypotaxis. Whatever may be thought of καί, τε—καί and τε—τε are as hypotactic as τοσοῦτον—ὅσον.

Position and correlation are, as we have seen, the great factors in the building up of the hypotactic sentence. Correlation grows by position and never can dispense with position, whereas position can dispense with correlation. You can use ὅς alone, but as soon as you have the so-called antecedent you must put it where it will be felt. The shifting of the position is technically called hyperbaton and this hyperbaton or overleaping is possible only by a return to the primitive life of the language. The hyperbaton of the relative is a return to the demonstrative in Greek, to the interrogative in Latin. Separate the article, when it has become an article, from its substantive and the demonstrative nature comes back.

Position enables us to dispense with correlation it is true, but the expression of correlation is not a matter of indifference. The correlative style is more deliberate, better balanced, and the Greek loves balance, so that correlatives hold their own whereas the single element dies out. τε—τε, nay, for that matter, οὔτε—τε, μήτε—τε are more common than τε *solitarium*. We can gauge an author's style by his use of πρότερον—πρίν; and the expression of the correlative of ὥστε gives a certain grave deliberateness which the flippant afterthought ὥστε has not.¹ The absence of a regular correlative to the final sentence, to the conditional sentence, must also be taken into consideration when the effect as well as the genesis of these combinations is to be studied. The temporal sentence indulges freely in correlation but some forms avoid it. τέως—ἕως is as formal as a lawsuit, and the two are

¹ A. J. P. XIV 241. The correlative use of ὥστε and consequent stylistic effect has recently been elaborated in a special J. H. U. dissertation by W. A. Eckels: 'ὥστε as an Index of Style in the <Attic> Orators.

seldom seen together. Hence a certain masquerading *τέως* is sometimes used as *ἔως*, and *τέως* not unfrequently has an indefinite use. If *ἄν* had been blessed with a correlative, we should have less trouble with a particle which behaves as *τέως* behaves—now definite, now indefinite.

So important is the relative in the organization of the dependent sentence that all hypotactic sentences have been considered in some sort relative sentences, as each class of sentences is introduced by relative or, which is the same thing, demonstrative particles. The conditional *εἰ* is, according to some scholars, a manner of relative, and in explaining the anomalous intruder, *πρίν*, recourse has been had to *ἤ*, which has also been considered a relative. But the relative sentence has a life of its own, and the parallels so frequent between the relative sentence and the other forms often do harm. *ὅς ἄν* does not go the whole way with *ἐάν*. The final relative sentence is put in the future indicative, not in the subjunctive. Each class of sentences gets habits of its own, and the deviation from these habits gives variety, gives undulation to style, variety and undulation which cannot be appreciated unless there be a norm. Long familiarity with the trim garden of Attic syntax is a necessary preliminary to the enjoyment of the luxuriance of Homeric syntax. Only one must be careful to do justice to the luxuriance and not deny law because the phyllotaxy is not at once apparent.

The subdivision of hypotactic sentences into the various familiar categories has undeniable practical advantages and is not lightly to be given up, though all logical categories are open to suspicion. But so far as I am aware, no one has made a careful study of the proportion of these classes in different authors. Inside the different classes something has been done, but one would like to know which author leans to the final, which to the conditional, which prefers the participle, which the object sentence. In this whole line of research only beginnings have been made. So we know that in Aischylos the conditional sentence is rare in comparison with Euripides. It is an epitome of the difference between the two great poets, between the gravity of the Areiopagos and the mobility of the Heliaia. The relative sentence is less analytic than the final, than the temporal, the participle than all these. And under the different classes of sentences what variety of usage, what interesting coincidences of usage. Pindar and Aischylos, so alike and yet so different, make

kindred use of the logical conditional. It is a severe note that is not to be disregarded. It is a sharp line of Kalamis. Under the head of the temporal sentence it has been noted that *ἕως* encroaches on *πρίν* and actually steals some of *πρίν*'s peculiar territory, until familiar *οὐ πρότερον—πρίν* is replaced by *οὐ πρότερον—ἕως*. What is that but the encroachment of the reflective on the naïve, just as the growing use of *naïf* for naïve is a token of the encroachment of the reflective on the *naïf* naïve? *πρίν* is equivalent to *ἕως* only by inference. *ἕως* itself is more accurate, more prosaic. One can almost hear the voice of some ancient pedant saying as Whitelaw has said, '*πρίν* can never be *ἕως*'. No! but it connotes *ἕως* and if it were not for connotation where would many scholars be? The tendency to simplification, which we notice in the healthy language, is accelerated in the decline. As the pure subjunctive of the conditional sentence gives way to the *ἐάν* form and all Homeric differences are swept away, so in later Greek *ἐάν* is found in place of *εἰ* before the indicative, and even intrudes into the sphere of the simple *ἄν*. *ὅς ἐάν* is used for *ὅς ἄν*; *πρίν* with subjunctive usurps the place of *πρίν* with infinitive; *πρίν ἤ* runs riot. We say to ourselves, 'Chaos and Old Night. There are no problems of Greek syntax possible. We are in the realm of Solecism'. But that is not true. Language remains organic. The laws of the death are the laws of the life. Deorganization is unravelling and the unweaving teaches us the weaving.

Here I made a provisional end nine years ago; and I have little desire to continue the plea for the kind of studies to which I have for so many years been addicted. That I am not altogether a stranger to the problems of genetic syntax, that I too have occupied myself somewhat with the histology of speech, that my formulae are the results of a study of the living forces of language and not mere convenient summaries of phenomena, I do not care to show in detail. My reward has been the contemplation of the beautiful workings of the beautiful language to which so much of my life has been given up, and so far as human approval is concerned let it be said at the last: *Vagliagli il lungo studio e il grande amore.*

ADDENDUM.¹

The participle is not a mood but it is susceptible of modal relations, and the future tense of it is almost wholly modal, is almost wholly final. But when we first meet the participle, it has only the capabilities of the modal life which it afterwards developed. When we first find it, it is an adjective *plus* tense and clings to its substantive like a skin. True, it is not the tight skin of man or woman, but rather the loose skin of lion or tiger. Still, it will not come off and in fact never comes off; and this is our difficulty in dealing with the Greek participle. We too have a participle, and, under Latin influences, under French influences, our participle has acquired much of the mobility of the classic tongues.² And yet we feel distinctly when the line is overstepped, as it is overstepped by Milton, whose syntax is unnaturally close to his antique models, and who uses the participle, especially in its absolute form, with the utmost freedom. When he says,

Doth God exact day-labour, light denied?

we understand perfectly, we understand immediately, we do not stop to ask whether he means 'when light is denied', 'if light be denied', 'though light be denied', but, after all, analysis would be more natural to us, and we are not satisfied to state relations so concretely as they appear in participial compression, to say nothing of the lumbering form of our perfect participle active, which can not vie with the Greek aorist in lightness and which is too stiff for conversational purposes. When, therefore, we attack the Greek participle in translation, actual or mental, we are apt to bring to bear a number of logical categories, causal, adversative, concessive, conditional, what not. Now the early Greek did not analyze as we analyze, and the Homeric grammarian is right

¹To be inserted p. 132, l. 16 from bottom after '*μή* with the participle'. By some mischance the section on the participle which was to have followed the treatment of the infinitive in this little series went astray. But the demands of the press are remorseless and I consoled myself by thinking that the subject had been fairly covered by my elaborate article in Vol. IX of the Journal and by my remarks in the Introduction to Pindar. So the printing went on without the section. However, on my return to Baltimore the missing MS turned up and it may possibly be worth the space which is given to it here.

²Nothing could be more exotic than Caxton's participialities. His Eneydos (1490) begins thus: After dyverse werkes made, translated and achieved, having no werke in hande, I sitting in my studye whereas lay many dyvers paunflettis and bookes, happened that to my hande cam a lytyl booke in Frenshe. (Kellner.)

when he implies that it is a mistake grammatically to sort Homeric participles into categories.¹ There is but one category, the temporal. All else is inference. And the same thing is generally true of Pindar (see I. E. cx), though it is in Pindar that we find a portentous advance. But the beginnings of analysis are there. The causal may still be merged in the temporal, but *καί—περ* in Homer, *καίπερ* in Pindar, is made to bring out the adversative element, though even that is mainly left to circumstance. There is nothing, however, to force the conditional. There is no *μή* with the participle in Homer, after the fashion so familiar to us in post-Homeric Greek, and, with the assumption of *μή*, the participle enters upon a new and more conscious life. The addition of *μή* to the participle marks a new era in the history of the language. It affects participle and negative alike. The participle is more conscious of its resources, and *μή* extends its empire. The negative of will becomes the negative of idea. *τὸ μή* with the infinitive had the imperative note to begin with, but in *ὁ μή* with the participle the imperative note is fainter. It merely echoes the *μή* of the conditional sentence, and the *μή* of the logical condition seems to be an intruder.²

B. L. G.

¹ Vogrinz says briefly but emphatically (S. 278): Die 'Auflösungen' der Partizipien sind *rein logische Operationen*. See also Bolling, l. c., p. 426.

² In the first part of this series a few typographical errors and other slips have been noted. Most of them correct themselves, such as p. 23 l. 3 from bottom 'phenomena' for 'phenomenon', p. 25 l. 6 from bottom 'department' for 'departments.' 'Calf-skin' for 'calf's skin', p. 18 l. 8 from top, is a slip of the pen about which a page might be written. More serious is p. 20 l. 17 from top where for 'case of verbs' read 'case of doubt.' The Latin example p. 8 l. 8 from top is not apposite and should be omitted. P. 17 l. 3 from bottom cite: R. S. Radford, Personification and the Use of Abstract Subjects in the Attic Orators and Thukydides, J. H. U. Diss. just published though referred to in A. J. P. XX III.

II.—THE TALE OF GYGES AND THE KING OF LYDIA.

I.

It is unusual that a people of such evident importance in its time as the Lydians has dropped so completely from the pages of history. Once a proverb of luxury, wealth and power, Lydia, now, is hardly more than a land of dreams, peopled, in the main, by a long procession of shadowy potentates whose odd barbaric names suggest, in their very sound, another age and a vanished world. Two, it is true, will never be forgotten while men read the classics. Yet even these live more in story than in fact. They are throned in their great citadel of Sardis like Haroun al Raschid in his Bagdad or Charlemagne in his Paris. These two are Gyges, the Henri Quatre, and Kroisos, the Louis Quatorze, of the Lydian Mermnadai.

Gyges, whose commanding yet curiously complex personality is still clearly felt in the tradition of him, was the first great "barbarian" with whom the Hellenic world had come in close contact. He was associated with the early traditions of art¹ as well as of other inventions much less creditable to himself.² In the time of Archilochos his wealth was a by-word.³ His attacks

¹ Pliny, N. H., VII 205, "Pythus pilam lusoriam, Gyges Lydus picturam in Aegypto, etc." So the older editions, and cf. Müller, FHG, II 182, 257. But, "athleticam Pythus, pilam lusoriam Gyges Lydus, picturam Aegyptii, etc." is adopted by Mayhoff after Urlichs' plausible suggestion in JJ, LXXVII 489. It is to be observed, however, that Kandaules is connected with the history of art. See note 4, p. 278. It is, also, to be observed that Urlichs' emendation gives us the only passage connecting Gyges with the history of ball-play.

On the invention of this game see, especially, Athen., I 14, d, f. The subject was much discussed in antiquity.

² See Müller, FHG, I 40: II 171, 47.

³ *Ὁδὲ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρήστου μέλει.*

Archiloch., frag. 25, Bergk, PLG (cf. his note).

Otto, Sprichwörter der Römer, Leipzig, 1890, p. 99, note, observes that Gyges was a proverb for wealth among the Greeks and quotes Alpheios of Mitylene, Anth. Pal., 9, 110,

upon the cities of the coast—for, like the Czar, he saw the value of harbors—his gallant and prolonged struggle with the Terror of the North, still echo in the fragments of those great lyric poets of whom he was practically the contemporary. Above all, his appeal to Delphi, accompanied by a most substantial fee, to arbitrate his right to the throne insured, for all time, a lively and favorable tradition of this particular event in his career. We never hear the last of those gifts. Few were better calculated to figure in the realm of folk-lore than this man, who went about his far-reaching plans with such skill and rapidity that no one could tell what was coming next, whose versatile character, by turns bold and subtle, cruel and kind, luxurious and stern, was

οὐ στέργω βαθυλήτους ἀρούρας,
οὐκ ὀλβον πολύχρυσον, οἷα Γύγης,

and Anacreontea, 7, 1, Cr.,

οὐ μοι μέλει τὰ Γύγω,
τοῦ Σαρδίων ἀνακτος·

To these may be added; Aristot., Rhet., 3, 17 (1418,^b 31), who quotes a portion of the Archilochian line and thus tends to insure it for the rhetorical tradition, Leonidas, Anthol. Pal., 7, 740, 3 (cf. 7, 709),

ὁ πρὶν καὶ Γύγη παρισσέμενος ὀλβον,

Bianor, Anthol. Pal., 9, 423, Lukian, Paras., 58, πλοῦσιος ἀνὴρ, εἰ καὶ τὸ Γύγον χρυσίον ἔχει, Philos., Vita Apollon., I 336, 31, K., ὁ δ' ὥσπερ τοὺς Γύγας φασὶ καὶ τοὺς Κροίσους ἀκλείστους παρέχειν τὰς τῶν θησαυρῶν θύρας, Greg. Naz. περὶ ἀρετῆς (37, 683, M.),

κάν σοι τὰ Γύγον τοῦ πολυχρύσου παρῇ,

and in another poem, to his soul (37, 1485, M.),

θέλεις τὰ Γύγῳ σοι
τοῦ Δυδίου γενέσθαι

(in both of these references Gyges is associated with Midas).

Strabo, 14, 680, 28 specifies the mines from which Gyges, Kroisos and others drew their wealth.

Observe that all of these poetical examples show a kinship with the line from Archilochos. In fact, they are probably an echo of it. Gregory, practically, copies it in his first example; in his second, he gets at it through the echo of the Anacreontic, οὐ μοι μέλει, etc. One, therefore, may fairly suspect that Gyges as a synonym of wealth was not strictly "sprichwörtlich bei den Griechen" in later times, but, more properly, an echo of Archilochos. As a matter of fact "the wealth of Gyges" is not found in any ancient collection of Greek proverbs, never occurs in the Roman authors, and, even in the Greek writers, soon faded out before the claims of Kroisos.

On Kroisos for wealth in Latin, see Otto, s. v. and Sutphen, A. J. P. XXII, p. 27.

associated with a policy which made his reign of nearly forty years one long story of struggle and adventure.

It is, therefore, by no means surprising that evidently as early as the period of Archilochos himself the lively and plastic fancy of the Ionians had begun to weave a web of tradition, partly of native and partly, it may be, of Lydian or Asiatic origin, about the name and person of one whom, in his time, they had had good reason to remember. The most notable of these traditions concerned themselves with the story of how Gyges rose to become king of Lydia and the founder of a new dynasty. Several versions have survived, and one or another of them may be traced by an occasional reference until within a short time of the fall of the Eastern Empire.

The object of this paper is to reconstruct the old popular tale of Gyges which appears to have been current in the times of Herodotos and Plato. My investigation does not concern itself with the ultimate origin or meaning of this story, its possible associations with the Herakles-Omphale cycle of legends, etc., etc.¹ Still less does it concern itself with the credibility of the various accounts. It makes no attempt to discover the genuine history of Gyges.²

The first account to be considered was found in the sixth book of the *Universal History* of Nikolaos Damaskenos.³ It reaches us only in an abstract made by Constantinus Porphyrogenetos.⁴

¹ All the Greek and Latin authors available to me were examined, through indices, of course, wherever they were to be had, if not, by a rapid survey of the text. Indices are proverbially inaccurate. In the present investigation cross-references have sometimes betrayed it. References are perhaps hidden away in the Greek Fathers. But Migne's publication is so huge that one must content himself with the indices, incomplete as they are. I trust, however, that all passages of any real importance in this investigation have been discovered. The rarity of reference in Latin authors is noteworthy.

² See, especially, Gelzer, *Rhein. Mus.*, XXX, 230-68; XXXV, 514-28; Schubert, *Könige von Lydien*, Breslau, 1884; E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Stuttgart, 1884; Duncker, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Leipzig, 1875, II, 424 f.; G. Radet, *La Lydie et le Monde Grec au Temps des Mermnades*, Paris, 1893; Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte*, Gotha, 1895, II, 450 f., and references.

³ On Nikolaos Damaskenos (time of Augustus and Tiberius) see especially Susemihl, *Gesch. d. Griech. Lit. in der Alexandriner Zeit*, Leipzig, 1892, II, 309-21; W. Christ, *Gesch. d. Griech. Lit. bis auf die Zeit Iustinians*, Munich, 1898, p. 644. Fragments in Müller's *FHG*, III 343-64, and Dindorf's *Historici Graeci Minores*, Leipzig, 1870, vol. I, pp. 1-153.

⁴ See, especially, Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur*, 2^d edit., Munich, 1897, p. 252.

in the tenth century. The substance of this account,¹ so far as it relates to us, is as follows:

"In the reign of Myrsos, Daskylos, the son of that Daskylos who had been assassinated by the king's father, fearing lest the Herakleidai would compass his death also, fled to the Syrians above Sinope. There he married a woman of the country and had by her a son, Gyges. There lived in Sardis an uncle of Gyges' father. His name was Ardys. Having lost his children, Ardys went to the king Sadyattes [son of Myrsos, and the Kandaules of Herodotos], asked for the recall of his nephew Daskylos and for permission to adopt him. The request was granted. Daskylos, however, preferred to remain where he was. But he sent in his place his son Gyges, at that time a youth of eighteen, remarkable for his size and beauty, a good soldier, and surpassing his equals in all things, but especially, in the management of arms and horses. These gifts and accomplishments soon recommended him to the king who made him one of his body-guard. Shortly after, however, Sadyattes became suspicious of him and exposed him to all sorts of perils and difficulties, being unwilling to destroy him openly, as he had no reasonable excuse. But inasmuch as Gyges performed all his tasks successfully the king finally forgot his former suspicions and gave him great estates.

"Some time later Sadyattes decided to take Tudo to wife, the daughter of Arnossos who was king of Mysia and founder of the city of Ardynios in the plain of Thebe. When the time came for fetching the bride, Sadyattes put Gyges in a chariot and sent him after her. At the time he was setting out it is said that her people saw two enormous eagles light above her bedroom and that the soothsayers interpreted the prodigy to mean that in the first night the girl would be the wife of two kings.

"Soon after Gyges arrived and took the girl away with him. But while riding with her in the chariot he became enamoured of her and, not being able to restrain himself, undertook to seduce her. She, however, being disinclined to him, fell in a furious rage, made all manner of threats and when she came to the king told him all. Whereat, the king was wroth and swore to kill Gyges the next day.

"Now this was heard by a maid who was in the bed-chamber at the time and, as she was deeply in love with Gyges, she immediately told him everything. Gyges went to all his friends during the night, confided the matter to them and, reminding them all of the curses which Ardys had called down upon the murderers of Daskylos, asked them to help him in his plan to kill the king.

"Therefore, thinking that, under the circumstances, it was better to slay Sadyattes than be slain by him and being assured of faithful friends to help him, Gyges broke into the palace, sword in hand, and, entering the chamber, the door of which was opened for him by the maid, killed Sadyattes in his sleep. His reign had lasted for three years.²

¹ FHG, III, 383, f., Dindorf, p. 32, f.

² The abstract of Porphyrogennetos is clearly incomplete. As the narrative of Damaskenos-Xanthos now stands the interpretation given by the soothsayers to the omen of the eagles is not justified. We may be perfectly certain that

"The next morning Gyges, quite at his ease, summoned both his friends and his enemies in the king's name, slew his adversaries and conciliated the rest with gifts. The people, however, made objection and the right of Gyges to the throne was formally referred to Delphi. The oracle supported Gyges but added that the Herakleidai would be given vengeance on the Mermnadai in the fifth generation.

"Thus Gyges Daskylos-son became king of Lydia and took to wife the Mysian woman, cherishing no malice for all she had said against him to Sadyattes."

This narrative of Damaskenos undoubtedly contains some traces of the old folk-tale, but, in its main features, it has been adopted by most modern historians, first, because of its apparent probability, second, because, though so late, it purports to be drawn from the old Lydian logographer, Xanthos.¹ His *Lydiaka*, in four books, was written between 465 and 425 B. C. Xanthos is credited with the use of native sources. But the question is complicated by the fact that some ancient critics doubted the genuineness of that *Lydiaka* which in later times passed under his name and would, therefore, be the work used by Damaskenos. Diogenes Laertios, VI 101, tells us that it was epitomized by a certain Menippos. Athenaios, XII 515 d, reports, but criticizes, the view of Artemon of Kasandreia that it was the work of Dionysios Skytobrachion.² Such a question is always capable of further discussion. But the statements of these ancient critics

it was justified or it would not have been mentioned. The missing passage falls in most naturally just after the king's death. In this passage—perhaps omitted *verecundiae causa*—we were told how Tundo became *de facto* the wife of Gyges and thus fulfilled the prediction of the Mysian soothsayers. An important variation between the account of Xanthos and Herodotos is thus shown to have been more apparent than real and the comment of Radet (l. c., p. 139) is rendered unnecessary. "Selon Xanthos," he says, "l'union de Gyges avec Tundo aurait suivi la réponse d'Apollon. D'après Hérodote, elle l'aurait précédée. Sur ce point les *Muses* doivent être crues de préférence aux *Lydiakes*."

Certainly, the statement of Gelzer (Rhein. Mus. XXXV 516) does not seem to be justified by the narrative of Damaskenos-Xanthos as it now stands. "In der Brautnacht," says Gelzer, "wird der Heraklide von Gyges erschlagen, und unmittelbar darauf heirathet er die Königin. Das Adleraugurium geht so in Erfüllung." Gelzer appears to refer to the statement which closes the passage which I quote from Xanthos.

¹ See Christ, l. c. p. 324 and notes. The fragments of the *Lydiaka* are collected by Müller, FHG, I, p. 36, f., and by Gutschmid, Kleine Schriften, IV, p. 307, f.

² See, especially, Susemihl, l. c. I, p. 511: II, p. 48, and, for the literature, II, p. 46, note 66.

are far less formidable when closely examined, and it is probably safe to believe, with most modern historians, that the narrative of Damaskenos, at least, in its essential details, reflects that of Xanthos.¹

I find no further traces of this version in ancient literature.

A second account is partially reported by Plutarch, *Aetia Graeca*, XLV, p. 301, f. In reply to the question why the statue of Zeus Labrandeus in Karia was represented with an axe (*πέλεκυς*), not with a sceptre or a thunderbolt, Plutarch states:

"Herakles, having slain Hippolyte and taken her axe with the rest of her arms, gave it to Omphale. The kings of Lydia who succeeded her carried this as one of their sacred insignia of office, and passed it down from father to son until Kandaules. Kandaules, however, disdained it and gave it to one of his *ἐταῖροι* to carry. When Gyges rebelled and was making war upon Kandaules, Arselis came with a force from Mylasa to the assistance of Gyges, slew Kandaules and the *ἐταῖρος*, and took the axe to Karia with the other spoils of war. And having set up a statue of Zeus, he put the axe in his hand and called the god, Labrandeus, *labrus* being the Lydian word for the Greek *πέλεκυς*."

Gelzer² defends this story as the genuine account. Schubert³ undertakes to reconcile it with Xanthos and Herodotos. E. Meyer⁴ dismisses it as "historisch werthlos," and, in fact, it has every appearance of being a mere aetiological fable. As such, this version, being devised simply to explain a local usage, probably never contained any further details than we have here.⁵ I find no other trace of it in the literature.⁶

Third, comes the famous version given by Plato. In the *Republic*, 359, d, f., the spokesman, discussing the well-known

¹ See, especially, Busolt, l. c., II, p. 451, f., with references.

² Rh. M. XXXV 528. Radet, l. c. p. 224.

³ Könige von Lydien, p. 31, f.

⁴ Geschichte des Alterthums, 1884, I, p. 547, note.

⁵ So far as I have been able to discover, no one ventures on a theory regarding Plutarch's source for this narrative.

⁶ Unless the *sodali suo* of Iustinus (I, 7, 17) is a translation of *ἐταῖρος* in the sense in which Plutarch uses it here, and a remote community of tradition was the cause. But the Thesaurus Steph. and the lexicons, in general, are somewhat unsatisfactory. Plutarch's use of *ἐταῖρος* is, perhaps, a mere secondary reflection of the peculiar Makedonian use found in Polybios (Athen. 194 e). At all events *ἐταῖρος* to describe the position of Gyges in the feudal system of old Lydia is an excellent prototype of *comes* as a designation of rank in the feudal system of mediaeval Europe. "Le mignon du roi" (discussed in the Thesaurus, s. v. *ἐταῖρος*) is not to be considered.

doctrine that the only thing which prevents even the best of us from doing wrong in the end is the fear of detection, asserts that his point would be proved if both a good and a bad man could be given some power which would render detection impossible. "I mean," he says, "such a power . . . as, they say, was once possessed by the ancestor of the Lydian:"¹

"[Gyges] was a shepherd in the service of the one who, in those days, was the king of Lydia. Owing to a great storm and also to an earthquake, the ground split open and a gap made its appearance near the place where he was watching his flocks. Amazed at the sight, Gyges went down into the cleft and, certainly according to the tale they tell, beheld marvels, among the rest a brazen horse, which was hollow and had doors. Gyges peeped in through them and saw a corpse inside, larger, as it appeared, than human size. There was nothing else at all but that. On its hand, however, was a ring of gold. This Gyges took off and came out. When the shepherds met as usual to make their monthly report to the king regarding his flocks, Gyges, who was wearing his ring, was one of the party. As he was sitting among the others he happened to turn the collet of it towards him and into the inside of his hand. The moment this was done he became invisible to those who sat near him, and they began to talk about him as they would about one who was absent. Astonished, he ran his hand over the ring, turned the setting out, and, as he did so, became visible again. Upon observing the fact, he tested the ring to see whether it had this power and found that such was really the case. Whenever he turned the setting inward he disappeared; when he turned it outward he became visible. Being now assured of the fact, he took measures to become one of the messengers to the king. After his arrival he seduced the queen, with her help set upon the king, slew him and took possession of the throne."

¹ The best tradition of the text here gives; *εἰ αὐτοῖς γένοιτο οἷαν ποτὲ φασιν δύναιεν τῷ Γύγον τοῦ Λυδοῦ προγόνῳ γενέσθαι*, i. e. not, "the ancestor of the Lydian", but "the ancestor of Gyges the Lydian." That Proklos also had this text before him is shown by the fact that in his commentary on the Republic (60, 31, Schoell) he speaks of this story as, *τῷ κατὰ τὸν Γύγον πρόγονον διηγήματι*.

The text of Plato is certainly corrupt and has been much discussed. See the various commentators on this passage, especially, Stallbaum. The account of Xanthos shows that Gyges had the same name as his great-grandfather. Indeed the name appears to have been by no means uncommon among the Lydians. But the discussion of our text is much simplified by the fact that we are safe in rejecting all emendations and all explanations except that which identifies the hero of this story with the Gyges of Xanthos and Herodotos. This is shown by Plato himself at 612, B, and is supported by the literary tradition of our passage. Moreover, as I hope to show, Plato is telling here the first half of the story which Herodotos had before him.

The simplest remedy is merely to bracket *Γύγον*, evidently a gloss. This

Plato refers to this story again at 612, B, where he couples with the ring of Gyges the Homeric "Αἶδος κινέη.

No one needs to be reminded that, whatever its earlier history or original source, this is the old folk-tale of Gyges. Three favorite motifs of all popular stories are at once prominent here—the miraculous rise of the weak or lowly to happiness, fame and fortune,¹ a magic ring,² the circumstances of its discovery.

was proposed by Wiegand (*Zeit. f. d. Alterth.*, 1834, p. 863) and is now generally adopted. In that case τῷ προγόνῳ = Γύγη and τοῦ Λυδοῦ = the Lydian, i. e., Kroisos, an interpretation fully justified by the fame of Kroisos, not only in the time of Plato but for centuries afterward.

¹ A favorite motif in the popular stories of men who, like Gyges, have been the founders of great royal houses. Gelzer, *Rhein. Mus.* XXXV 515 notes this and quotes Sargon, Kyros, Arsakes, Artaxerxes, and David. One might add Romulus and many others. In a humbler sphere we have Dick Whittington and the large class of stories represented by such nursery-favorites as "Jack and the Bean-stalk" and "Jack the Giant-killer."

The motif is not infrequently combined with that of the "Lucky Impostor," See the interesting chapter in W. S. Clouston's *Popular Tales and Fictions*, Blackwood, London, 1887, vol. II, p. 413, f. An excellent example of this type is the story of "Ma'aruf the Cobbler and his wife Fatimah," *Book of the Thousand Nights and a Night*, vol. X, p. 1, f. (Burton).

² Magic rings conferring various extraordinary powers, or worn as amulets or charms against disease, enchantment, the Evil Eye, etc., etc., played a very important part in the folk-lore of classical antiquity. Commentators refer to Kirchmann, *de Annulis*, XXI, which is not available to me. Lobeck, *Aglaoph.* I, p. 377, has a brief note; see also Blaydes on Aristoph., *Plutus*, 884 and the schol. The note of Casaubon on 'Athenaios, III 34' to which reference is made by several generations of commentators, is concerned with a fragment of Antiphanes (II 84, Kock) quoted by Athenaios at III 96 (123, b). Other references in the comic poets to magic rings are Eupolis 87 (I 278, K), perhaps Aristoph., frag. 250 (I 455, K) and Kratinos, 299 (I, 99-100, K). Cf. Theophrastos, *Char.* XVIII; Lukian, *Philops.*, 17; *Navig.* 42; Pliny, XXXIII 8, f.; Ammianus, XXIX 1, 31; Heliodoros, *Aithiop.*, pp. 107, 17; 134, 24; 234, 15 (Bekker), etc. The power of any magic ring (ancient or modern) usually lies in the setting, which really connects the idea with that of talismans in general and would involve us in the consideration of Nikandros,—Pliny, Damigeron, Dioscorides, the Orphica, and all those authors or references dealing with the properties of precious stones, minerals and other substances.

The classical legend of a ring of invisibility comes to the surface only in connection with Gyges and, for the first time, in the passage from Plato under discussion. The earliest reappearance which I find of this idea in the Middle Ages is the ring of Lunet in Chrestien de Troyes' *Yvain*, 1034, f (repeated in the old English translation, *Ywayne and Gawin*, line 737, f., Ritson's 'Ancient Metrical Romances', Edinburgh, 1884, I, p. 137, and referred to, as a famous

Indeed, this story might well have belonged to the repertory of the genial Scheherazade herself.¹ The striking similarity of it to that oriental type so well represented by the "Thousand Nights and a Night" suggests that, however modified by the Greek story-tellers, it had an Asiatic origin.² If such were the case, a larger knowledge of old Lydian folk-lore in general than is now available would, doubtless, be of assistance in the reconstruction of it. For, in the version before us, the entire second half of the original story is contained in the bare statement of the last sentence.

It is also clear that, for several reasons, the first half of the

passage, by Heinrich von dem Türlin in his *Crône*, p. 17, Schöll—passage quoted by Holland on *Yvain* l. c.). In his introduction to Chrestien's *Yvain*, Halle, 1891, Foerster suggests that this passage is a reminiscence of Gyges (?). In the *Roman de Troie*, Joly, Paris, 1870, line 1663, f., Medea gives Jason a ring of invisibility. But the most famous is the ring of Angelica, Boiardo, I 1, 39; 14, 42; II 5, 33 (Panizzi's edit. London, 1834); Ariosto, XI 6, f. See, also, Grimm, D. M., II, p. 1171.

Famous, too, was the ring of youth which the Fata Morgana gave to Ogier the Dane in Avalon. In fact, rings conferring various powers are a favorite device of the Romans d'Aventure. Cf. Chrestien de Troyes, *Yvain*, 2600, f., 2770, f.; *Chevalier de la Charrette*, p. 66 (Reims 1849); *Roman d'Aspremont*, 1313, f.; *Floire et Blanceflor*, 1005, f. (cf. p. clxii, f. of du Méril's edit.); *Roman de Florimont* (passage quoted by du Méril, l. c. p. clxiv). Rings of forgetfulness: Rotrou's *La bague de l'oubli*, and *L'innocente infidélité*. Rings of love: *Gesta Romanorum*, ch. 46 (quoted by Clouston, *Popular Tales and Fictions*, London, 1887, I, p. 108), Legrand, *Le roi de Cocagne*.

A vast amount of variant literature, etc., is connected with the old fabliau by Haisiau, *Recueil général et complet des Fabliaux des XIII^e et XIV^e siècles*, etc., Montaiglon et Raynaud, Paris, 1878, vol. III, p. 51, f. References gathered by J. Bedier, *Les Fabliaux, Études de littérature populaire*, etc., du moyen âge, Paris, 1895, p. 442, B.

The ring which summons a spirit ready and able to fulfil any wish is, for the modern world, chiefly associated with Aladdin, and other tales of the "Thousand Nights and a Night."

Famous in Northern Mythology is the ring of the dwarf Andvari, *Völsunga-saga*, XIV, f.

¹ Compare, e. g., 'Aladdin and his Wonderful Lamp', with Clouston's comments and discussion, l. c., I 314, f., 470, f. and Burton, l. c., X 564, f.; the story of Ma'aruf, Burton, l. c., X 1, f.

² On the other hand, that this rich oriental type is really due to Greek influence is a thesis ably supported by Rohde, *Der Griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*, Leipzig, 1900, p. 578, f. (or *Verhandlungen der XXX. Philologen-Versammlung zu Rostock*, 1875, p. 55-70).

story was curtailed and simplified to a considerable degree. As Plato tells it, this tale is not independent and separate. It is a digression introduced solely for the purpose of illustrating a point in a serious philosophical discussion. As such, it should not be too long, too circumstantial or too dramatic; otherwise its purpose and *raison d'être* would have been defeated. Its subordinate, episodical character is emphasized by the use of *oratio obliqua* and the omission of proper names. In any attempt to reconstruct the popular legend it should also be remembered that, whereas, the object of the folk-tale was to describe the adventures of Gyges on his way to the throne, the object of Plato was simply to describe the powers which the ring conferred upon its possessor. In other words, it was a jewel which Plato cut to fit the setting in which he has placed it. How much he cut it cannot be discovered. Nevertheless, these considerations are of some value to one who attempts a reconstruction of the original. It is also fair to suppose that this story, in the time of Herodotos and Plato if not in the first place, possessed a good deal in the way of circumstantial details. This is suggested by the oriental coloring of it and the rich fancy of the nation by which it was transmitted.

We are, therefore, justified in suspecting that Plato's introductory sentence is, perhaps, only a brief or partial report of the original at this point. It probably had at least some account of the parentage of Gyges, his birth and early years, how and why he came to occupy the menial position which Plato mentions and Xenophon, *Kyrup.* 7, 2, 24, appears to have had in mind. It is even possible that some prodigy attending his birth was recorded here, some omen or experience showing that he was the favorite of a god and destined for higher things.

To have emphasized the lowly extraction of Gyges in this introduction, to have made his rise to power hinge entirely on the wonderful ring and his own sharp wits, would be eminently characteristic of the popular tale. To have said or implied that he was really something better than his fellows or even he himself supposed was also a favorite motif long before the time of the "Ugly Duckling," and, so far as Plato's abstract is concerned, is equally compatible with the story. But this point is incapable of proof and cannot be urged.

In his next sentence, Plato says, that in consequence of a storm

and an earthquake¹ the ground opened near the place where Gyges was keeping his sheep, and that, amazed at the sight, he went down into the cleft. This seems to be a fairly complete report of the original account. And the words naturally suggest that Gyges was alone at the time. The next sentence in Plato's narrative might also suggest it. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that Philostratos (II 137, 29, K.), who tells a portion of this story while discoursing on the men of the Heroic Age, says that "This thing was beheld by the shepherds round about Lydia with whom Gyges was serving at the time and was a marvel, for," etc. The difference may, of course, be due to the fact that Philostratos was simply quoting Plato from memory.² As I shall point out in a later article, the passage was committed to memory by the schoolboys of the second century. At the same time, we know from another reference that Philostratos was familiar with a version which was not derived from Plato, but, directly or indirectly, from the source of Plato. It is possible, therefore, that we have in this discrepancy a trace of the original story. Not Gyges alone, but a number of his fellows, were present at the time the chasm made its appearance. If so, they may have been pictured as letting him down into a place which he alone had the nerve—or the simplicity—to explore. The motif is familiar enough. Aladdin was sent down by the magician in a similar fashion. In fact, the tale of Aladdin and the tale of Gyges resemble each other in more than one respect.

Plato tells us in so many words that the folk-tale described many other marvels seen by Gyges in the chasm besides the brazen horse.³ No hint of what these marvels were has

¹ I see no special significance in the presence of storm and earthquake here beyond the obvious fact that at this point it was desirable to get the ground open, and the story has adopted a means more or less natural to the land of its birth. This, however, is the chief support of E. Müller's theory (Philol. VII 246, f.) that Plato's story of Gyges goes back to an old volcanic myth. On the other hand, Curtius, Arch. Zeit., XI 150, f., finds that Gyges (of this story) originated, not in fire but in water, and that he is, in some way, connected with the *Δίμνη Γυγαία* (Iliad, 20, 391, etc.). Doubtless, the incidents of the ring, its discovery, etc., are far older than Gyges Daskylos-son, but with this phase of the discussion I am not concerned.

² One must not make too much of such differences. Cicero's version, for example (de Officiis, III 38), does not agree throughout with Plato. Nevertheless, it is clear that Cicero was actually translating Plato's words.

³ καταβῆναι καὶ ἰδεῖν ἄλλα τε δὴ ἂ μυθολογοῦσιν θαυμάσια καὶ ἵππον χαλκοῦν.

reached us. Whatever they were, they, very possibly, helped to explain the significance of the brazen horse and, perhaps, the identity of the person within it. Such descriptions are eminently characteristic of the oriental type. They are frequently associated, as here, with the subterranean motif, and generally lead up to the object of real importance—a chest, a tomb, a pillar, a statue, or what not. It is often covered with inscriptions in unknown languages, may be opened only by some prescribed formula, is guarded by various magic devices in the way of scimitars, etc., etc.¹ Plato's description of the object of real importance here, the horse and its contents, is, doubtless, a tolerably complete report of the original.

That the material should be bronze was to be expected. Bronze has been associated with magic and magicians for ages.²

The contents are equally suggestive of magic. They seem to have been a surprise to Gyges.³ They are not a surprise to us. The analogy of numberless stories had already prepared us to

¹ On the subterranean motif, its association with treasures, talismans, magicians, etc., etc., compare the stories mentioned in note 1, p. 269; Rohde-Schoell, *Griechischer Roman*, 394 and note 2. In the "Thousand Nights and a Night" the motif is too frequent to deserve specific mention here.

² This was observed by the ancients themselves. See, especially the comment of Macrobius (V, XIX 8, f.) on Vergil, *Aen.* IV 513 (the cutting of magic plants by moonlight with brazen shears). Macrobius quotes a passage from the *Πεζοτόμοι* of Sophokles (491, N) in which Medea is described as doing the same thing; cf. Ovid, *Met.* VII 227; Her. VI 84; Val. Flaccus, VII 364, f.; [Seneca, *Medea*, 722, f.].

In the same passage Macrobius quotes Carminius (see Ribbeck, *Proleg.* to Verg. p. 186) to the effect that among the Sabines the hair of priests was cut only with brazen shears; cf. Laurent. *Lyd.*, de *Mens.*, I 31; Serv. *Aen.* I 448, and R. Peter, *Quaest. Pontif. Spec.*, Argentorati, 1886.

Macrobius, l. c., also quotes Carminius for the Etruscan use of a brazen plough in marking out a new town; cf. Plutarch, *Rom.* XI, and Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Mythol.*, I, p. 131, note 1, with references.

Doubtless, the well-known practice of beating upon brazen instruments during an eclipse belongs in the same category. Examples are numerous; cf. Tibullus, I 8, 21; Ovid, *Met.* IV 333; VII 207 (cf. F., V 441); Livy, XXVI 5; Tacitus, *Ann.*, I 28; Juvenal, VI 442; Martial, XII 57, 14; Anthol. Lat., 483, R; Ducange, s. v. 'Vince, Luna'; Grimm, *D. M.*, II, p. 668, etc., etc.

Speaking in general, bronze, doubtless, did not acquire any sacred or magical qualities until after the age of iron was an accomplished fact. It was then retained in certain specified uses by religious conservatism and thus gradually acquired magical associations. See, also, P. Huvelin, *Les Tablettes Magiques et le Droit Romain*, Macon, 1901, p. 21, n. 5, etc.

³ ἐγκύψαντα ἰδεῖν ἐνόντα νεκρόν . . . τοῦτον δὲ ἄλλο μὲν οὐδέν.

discover here the last resting-place of some important person, a king, a magician, or both in one, seeing that he was *μεῖζον ἢ κατ' ἀνθρώπων* and, therefore, belonged to the days of old, when men were larger than they are now and magic was an ordinary possession. His ring would possess some supernatural quality as a matter of course.

In many cases the identification of the corpse with some famous character adds point to the story.¹ There is no hint in Plato that such was the case here. But it is at least worth while to note in this connection a curious passage from Pliny, N. H., XXXIII 8, in which he mentions the *Midae quidem anulum, quo circumactio, habentem nemo cerneret*. I fail to find any other reference which makes Midas the possessor of a ring exactly like that of Gyges.

In the absence of all other testimony, how shall we explain this single passage? Shall we suppose that Pliny has simply confused Gyges with Midas? Midas, like Gyges, was also a proverb of wealth. He was also another hero of legend and from the same locality.² But the evidence of extant literature all goes to show that the story of Gyges was familiar. For that reason Pliny's reference is less likely to be merely a mistake. It is not usual to confuse the better known with the less known. Moreover, Pliny is not habitually inaccurate and there are no signs of textual corruption here.

We might also suppose that Pliny is referring to a story of Midas which was quite independent of the story of Gyges,³ current in antiquity but, as it happens, not otherwise known to us. But if this had been the case, it would have been far more natural for Pliny to mention Gyges instead of Midas, or, else, both. The passage is one which deals with rings, their uses and properties.

Or, lastly, shall we suspect that Pliny alone has preserved for us a trace of either the old folk-tale of Gyges, or else some variant of it in one of those Alexandrian paradoxographi, for example, whom we know him to have read and excerpted with such

¹ Often, in stories of the oriental type, in the mediaeval poems and romances, etc.

² Commentators on this passage unite in quoting the references to Gyges' ring in Plato and Cicero, but do not commit themselves to any view.

³ So, apparently, E. Meyer, *Gesch. des Alterthums*, I p. 547. But his reference is too brief to be very definite.

eagerness? In short, was Pliny thinking of a version in which the corpse seen by Gyges in the brazen horse or, at all events, the ring, was that of Midas himself?¹

At first sight, this suggestion might appear argutior quam verior. Nevertheless, it seems to me the best explanation of Pliny's reference. It also introduces an element into the tale of Gyges which we constantly find in others of the same type. Moreover, in the popular mind, Gyges and Midas were, to a certain extent, associated. We find it in Gregory of Nazianzus, and the tradition of it is probably far older than his source, the rhetorical schools.² Whether this characteristic link of association, if we grant its existence, was actually in the source of Plato would, of course, be another question. But it is worth observing that the old folk-tale of Gyges—an extra-Platonian version—reappears, for the first time, in the period of Pliny. I shall give a detailed consideration to this reference in another connection. It is therefore the more likely that Pliny was acquainted with such a version and that his reference preserves a detail of it not elsewhere found.

That the hero and magician of old, whoever he was, should have been buried in a horse rather than in an object of some other shape is probably a detail of some importance, and it is possible that if we had a better knowledge of Lydian folk-lore, we might find the brazen horse valuable in the reconstruction of our story.³

¹ The historical and legendary Midases are so confused and commingled that we need not trouble ourselves about chronology, especially, in a popular legend.

² Both belonged to the same locality, both were proverbs of wealth, both were connected with the great invasion of the Kimmerioi.

³ But I fail to discover anything which has a bearing on this point. When Ištar offers her love to Izdubar he refuses the gift as quite too dangerous. 'What,' he asks, 'has become of all her previous lovers?' Izdubar then proceeds to name a few. Among the rest he mentions a horse who was son of the goddess 'Silili.' "Du hast auch geliebt ein Ross, erhaben im Streit, . . . mit Sporn und Peitsche hast du es genötigt; obgleich es sieben Meilen Galopp gelaufen war, hast du es genötigt, wenn es ermattet war und trinken wollte, hast du es genötigt, seiner Mutter, der Göttin *Silili* hast du Weinen aufgenötigt" (A. Jeremias, in Roscher's Lexikon, II, p. 790, 41, f.).

This reference, which I owe to Dr. Johnston, shows that there was a popular legend well known to the readers of the Nimrod-epic associating a horse with the Babylonian Aphrodite. But, of course, it is quite impossible to say whether there were any associations with the story in Lydian folk-lore that would account for the brazen horse which Gyges found. Indeed, it cannot be shown that our story really contains anything Asiatic.

In a legend of this type it is characteristic that, innocently or otherwise, Gyges, the favorite of fortune, should have passed by those "other marvels" which would have caught the ordinary eye¹ to select the one thing which, though apparently of small value, was really worth more than all the rest.

The next passage tells us how and where Gyges discovered the properties of his ring and how he then went to the city to seek his fortune. This is probably a complete record of the original story. These were the details bearing directly on the point which Plato desired to illustrate. When this was done he dismissed his narrative with the mere passing comment that after Gyges reached Sardis he "seduced the queen, with her help slew the king, and reigned in his stead."

It is clear that all Plato has told us with any approach to completeness is merely the introduction. The real story was, after all, the adventures with the ring. These practically began where Plato left off. In other words, the popular story bore a relation to Plato's account of it not unlike that which the tale of Aladdin would bear to an abridgment in which, after describing how he discovered his lamp and its properties, we should close with the bare statement that Aladdin then "married the beautiful princess and, in good time, reigned in her father's stead." This is really the substance of Aladdin's career. But, in itself it would give us a very slight idea of that long story of adventure with which most of us are familiar.

The fourth account of Gyges' rise to the throne of Lydia is related by Herodotos, I, 8-15. He says that Kandaules, whom the Greeks call Myrsilos, was the last of the Herakleidai to reign in Sardis. After a brief digression on the early history of Lydia, Herodotos tells the following story of his downfall:

"Well, then, this Kandaules fell in love with his own wife, and, being in love with her, maintained the opinion that his wife was much the fairest of all women. One of his body-guard was Gyges Daskylos-son and the especial favorite. Hence, with the feelings he had, it came to pass that Kandaules, who was also in the habit of entrusting Gyges with his more important affairs, grew to praising overmuch the beauty of his wife. After a short time had elapsed—for it was decreed that Kandaules should come to ruin—he spoke to Gyges in this wise; 'Gyges, when I tell thee of my wife's loveliness, methinks

¹ Compare the passage from Philostratos II 137, 31, f. (K.). So Ma'aruf, in the story referred to in note 1, p. 269, when he discovers the hoard of treasures, at once selects the wonderful ring.

thou dost not believe me (in fact men's ears are naturally less trustworthy than their eyes). Therefore, do thou contrive to behold her naked.' But Gyges with a great cry made answer; 'Master, what word unwise is this that thou dost utter, bidding me look upon my mistress when she is naked? Woman, in putting off her raiment, also putteth off her respect. Of old, men discovered those things which are proper, and these should be our guide. Among them this is one; a man should look upon his own. Verily I do believe thee that she is the fairest of all women and I beseech thee not to ask of me that which is unlawful.' Saying such words as these Gyges tried to put off the matter, being sore afraid that some disaster befall him from it. But Kandaules replied in these words; 'Take courage, Gyges, and have no fear either of me, lest I say this to test thee, or, yet, of my wife lest any hurt through her come to thee. For, first of all, I will so contrive it that she shall not discover that she hath been seen by thee. I will place thee behind the open door of the room wherein we sleep. I enter first, then my wife comes to bed. There is a chair near the entrance; on this she lays her garments, one by one, as she takes them off and thou wilt have the opportunity of gazing upon her quite at thy leisure. But so soon as she walks away from the chair to the bed and her back is toward thee, the rest must be thy care that she see thee not as thou goest through the door.' Well, then, perceiving that he could not escape it, Gyges held himself in readiness.

"So, when bed-time came, Kandaules led Gyges to the chamber and afterwards straightway the woman came also. She entered, laid her garments on the chair, and Gyges gazed upon her. When she went toward the bed and her back was turned, Gyges stealthily slipped away. The woman, however, saw him as he was passing out. But divining that her husband was the cause of what had happened she made no outcry because of the shame put upon her nor gave one sign that she had noticed aught, being minded to take vengeance upon Kandaules. For among the Lydians, often, too, among the other barbarians, even for a man to be seen naked is reckoned a deep disgrace. At the time then, as I have said, she gave no sign at all and held her peace. The instant, however, that it was day she made ready such of the house-slaves as she saw were especially faithful to herself and then sent for Gyges. He had been in the habit before this of going to the queen at her call. It was, therefore, without a suspicion that she knew aught of what had occurred that he obeyed her summons now.

"When Gyges arrived the woman said these words; 'Now there are two possible courses open to thee, Gyges. I give thee the choice of whichever thou art minded to follow. Either slay Kandaules and take for thine own me and the kingdom of Lydia or else, here and now, thou shalt die thyself, so that thou mayest not in the future obey Kandaules in all things and see that which thou shouldst not. Verily, he that did devise this shall die, or else thou that sawest me naked and didst that which is not fitting and lawful.

As for Gyges, he was for a time stunned by her words; then he began to entreat her not to force him into making such a choice. But truly in no way at all could he move her, on the contrary, he saw that the necessity was really before him of either slaying his master or of being slain himself by others. He chose to survive. And so he enquired of her, speaking thus: 'Since thou forcest me to slay my master, against my will, come then, let me hear how we are to set

upon him.' And replying she said: 'The attack shall be in the place wherein he showed me naked unto thee and the assault shall be when he is asleep.'

"So they contrived the plot: when night came on, Gyges (for he could not free himself, he had not one chance of escape, but either he or Kandaules had to die) followed the woman to the chamber. And giving him a dagger she hid him behind the self-same door. And after this, when Kandaules had fallen asleep, Gyges stole up, slew him, and took possession of both his wife and his kingdom. [Archilochos of Paros, who lived about the same time, makes mention of him in iambic trimeter.]

"Gyges held the throne and was confirmed in it by an answer of the Delphian oracle, etc."

The sources of this story have also been the subject of much discussion. Ephoros (Athen. XII 515, d) expressly stated that Herodotos depended on Xanthos for those portions of his narrative which have to do with Lydian affairs. But the nature of the dependence is somewhat vaguely defined and its probability is considerably impaired by Dionysios of Halikarnasos, Arch. Rom. I 28. At all events, so far as this particular story is concerned, dependence on Xanthos is anything but likely, and every attempt to prove any direct connection has failed.¹ The points of contact are amply explained by supposing that we have here two versions of the same story, distinct, but, to a certain extent, dealing with a similar tradition of the facts. This seems to be the view of Schubert, Meyer, Radet, Busolt and the majority of modern investigators. It is the only theory which will account for the situation.

What, then, were the probable sources of this narrative? The old lyric poets² and the Delphian temple tradition,³ especially

¹ The most important attempt in recent years was that of Pomtow, *De Xantho et Herodoto rerum Lydiarum scriptoribus*, Halle, 1886. But see the criticisms of this dissertation by Sitzler and Kaerst, *Burs. Jahresbericht* etc., 1889, p. 261 and p. 323. For the chief modern literature on this subject see Busolt, l. c., II, p. 451, notes 2 and 3.

² I have bracketed the sentence referring to Archilochos in deference to most of the modern editors. But whether the sentence is genuine or not, the 'trimeter' referred to is apparently nothing more than the one quoted in note 3, p. 261; i. e., τοῦ (τοῦ καὶ Ἀρχιλόχου, etc.) = Gyges. The statement of Iuba (Rufinus, VI 563, 16, K.), "[Archilochus] qui Gygae fabulam optime complexus est" "must not," says Bergk (PLG, II, 4 p. 390, n.), 'be pushed too far by those who claim that Archilochos dealt at large with the career of Gyges.' If Iuba had our text of Herodotos before him, as he seems to have had, he probably took τοῦ as = not Gyges, but the preceding statements. Hence his remark quoted by Rufinus.

³ See R. Schubert, l. c. p. 30, f. An element in the Greek tradition is the

the latter, should doubtless be considered, though neither can be proved.

But I agree heartily with the view expressed by Stein,¹ and after him by E. Meyer,² that what Herodotos probably had before him was the folk-tale of Gyges. In other words, it is here that we must look for that second part of the story which Plato told. Let us see, first, whether any support for this theory may be found in the narrative itself as it stands.

On the face of it at least, there is nothing *per se* incredible in the story of Herodotos. Indeed, several of the main facts are essentially the same as in Xanthos. Gyges was the son of Daskylos; he was one of the king's guard and especially favored; he became involved in trouble through a complication with the queen brought about by the king himself; through her he was forced to slay the king in order to save his own life; he made her his queen;³ his right to the throne was finally settled by an appeal to Delphi. In itself, too, the act of Kandaules is not only credible⁴ but highly characteristic of a certain type of man; and

connection of the old Lydian dynasty with Herakles. This was, probably, worked out by those Greek poets, epic and otherwise, who sung the praises of Kroisos. It is, also, possible that Hekataios or some author dependent upon him should be reckoned among the sources of Herodotos. Cf. the authorities cited by Busolt, l. c., II, 452, notes 2 and 3. On the relation to Herakles, see also E. Meyer, *Forsch.*, I 167; Cauer, *Rhein. Mus.*, XLVI 244; Tümpel, *Philol.*, N. F., IV 607, and O. Gruppe, *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1902, p. 495, f.

¹ Note on Herod. I, 12, 8, according to Busolt, l. c., II 457, note 1. But I failed to find it in Stein.

² *Gesch. des Alterthums*, II, p. 458, note.

³ I have already pointed out that the difference between Herodotos and Xanthos regarding the time of Gyges' marriage (whether before or after the appeal to Delphi) is more apparent than real. See note 2, p. 264.

⁴ Compare Radet, l. c., p. 131; "Il n'y a rien d'anormal à ce qu'un souverain d'orient se soit enorgueilli de son harem. Tout au contraire. Ensuite, dans cette frénésie d'enchantement qu'inspire à Candaule une forme admirable, il se pourrait qu'à la vanité amoureuse se mêlât quelque sentiment esthétique. Hérodote n'est pas seul à présenter le Sandonide comme un amateur du beau, passionément épris du charme des lignes et des contours. C'est bien une physionomie d'artiste que Pline lui attribue" [XXXV 34, 2; VII 39, 1; cf. VII 57, 14]. "Candaule eut, à n'en pas douter, le goût des arts, et ce fut très probablement ce dilettantisme qui donna lieu à la tradition populaire dont Hérodote s'est fait l'écho."

It is this type of a man which Gautier has drawn with great care in his well-known story, 'Le Roi Candaule'.

as for the queen's revenge, it was long ago observed that it has a striking resemblance to the one which the famous but less scrupulous Rosamund¹ wreaked upon her husband, Alboin, first king of the Lombards.

On the other hand, setting aside the element of marvel, the narrative of Herodotos contains very little to prevent it from harmonizing with the popular legend as it appears in the last sentence of Plato's abridgment. As a matter of fact only one important difference is visible. Gyges did not seduce the queen. Indeed, the wife of Kandaules is something more than beautiful. She moves in a different world from that of the rather colorless Tulo of Xanthos. Xanthos, says Busolt, shows an especial sympathy with her. This is true in so far as he does not make her an accomplice of Gyges. But Herodotos has made a woman and a queen of her. He also shows a greater sympathy with Gyges than is found in Xanthos. This is clearly in line with the popular legend. But, no doubt, his view was also supported by the Delphian tradition and, perhaps, by references in the lyric poets.

It will be seen, therefore, that the folk element in the story of Herodotos cannot be detected by the test of incredibility *per se*. Not even the variations from the assumed standard account of Xanthos can be attributed to the popular story without some

¹ See Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. XLV (vol. V, p. 12, f., Bury). Baehr, on Herod. I, 9, refers to F. C. Schlosser, *Weltgeschichte*, II 1, p. 82, for the mediaeval authorities for the story of Rosamund. See also Felix Dahn, *Urgeschichte der germanischen und romanischen Völker*, Berlin, 1889, p. 201, f. (in W. Oncken's *Allgemeine Geschichte*, etc., vol. IV).

Among old chroniclers, the story of Rosamund is best told by Paulus Diaconus, *De Gestis Langobardorum* II, XXVIII (Migne's *Patrolog. Lat.*, XCV, p. 498, f.) and Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon* (Migne, *Pat. Lat.* CXCVIII, p. 936, f. or, Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, VII 413, f.).

The text of Macchiavelli's fine version in his *Istorie Fiorentine*, I, VIII, suggests that he had anticipated Gibbon in perceiving the resemblance to the tale of Herodotos.

The version by Gower, *Confessio Amantis*, I, 2458, f., appears to have been taken from Godfrey of Viterbo. See the English works of John Gower, ed. G. C. Macaulay, Oxford, 1901, vol. I, p. 476, f. This story, also appears among the Italian novellieri; cf. *Bandello*, parte III, nov. XVIII (vol. VII, p. 200 of Silvestri's *Novellieri Italiani*, Milan, 1814). Finally, I note four plays on this subject: Sir William D'Avenant's *Albovine, King of the Lombards*, 'Dramatists of the Restoration,' London, 1872, vol. I, p. 1, f.; A. C. Swinburne, *Rosamund, Queen of the Lombards*, New York, 1899; Giovanni Ruscellai, *Rosmunda*, Venice, Zoppino, 1528; Alfieri, *Rosamunda*, Milan, 1806.

further proof. Delphi, for example, or the poets, or even some other tradition, may have had an influence here. Indeed, as we have just seen, Xanthos, Herodotos, and, by implication, the popular story, clearly show a certain community of tradition which, perhaps, goes back ultimately to the facts of the case, or, at all events, to something like a common source. It is, for that reason, all the more difficult to trace the elements of each.

Let us now apply another test. Granting that Herodotos had the popular legend before him, no one, of course, would imagine that he would give it to us without change. For the purposes of sober and dignified history he would rationalize it if nothing else. This was an ordinary thing among the ancient historians. We know that Herodotos himself was more or less in the habit of rationalizing a legend which, after a comparison of other sources, if available, he believed to be true in its essential details. In rationalizing this story from the popular tale, the first step, of course, would be to expunge the ring and all the marvels connected with it. Therefore, to replace the ring motif in Herodotos ought to be one fair criterion of the theory, and also should give some idea how much his version may have been changed in other respects. Irrespective, too, of any further changes, the ring ought to fit best in the scars made by its removal. The application of this test here is not very encouraging at first sight. The ring fits the murder scene beyond a doubt. But it does not seem to fit the parallel episode of the door, the whole point of which was the fact that the queen *saw* Gyges. This also appears to throw out the folly of Kandaules and the queen's revenge, the two main points of our story. In fact, we are left with not so much as the last sentence of Plato, since one important detail of it—the love affair of Gyges and the queen—is not accounted for. Before giving this up, however, let us consider the story from another point of view.

The narrative of Xanthos contains an erotic motif. Indeed, love is really the essential element of it. We already know through Plato that in the folk-tale the erotic element was still further emphasized. No antique reference is needed to inform us that the strength, the beauty, the skill which Xanthos gave to Gyges reappeared in the popular tale. And although, as Tibullus very truthfully observes,

Forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis,

we know that in this case the natural advantages of Gyges were ably seconded by a ring which gave this favorite of Hermes and Aphrodite something more than the mere ability to disappear at will.

Now, at first sight, the story of Herodotos might not seem to contain an erotic element. But its absence is only apparent. Further consideration not only betrays traces of it, but suggests that he must have suppressed it as not befitting historical narrative in general, and two such famous characters in particular.¹

For example, no modern reader will have failed to observe that the royal lady of Lydia, though implying—as was quite natural and proper—that his choice was a matter of absolute indifference to herself, at the same time offered Gyges, on the one hand, an alternative which a man might be forgiven for finding it hard to refuse, and, on the other, one which, by leaving him his self-respect in so far as it could be done, softened, as much as possible, the odiousness of the task imposed. Herodotos takes the trouble to state twice over that Gyges was obliged to slay or be slain. There was no escape.²

But with all due deference to the queen whom Herodotos has pictured for us, her punctual payment in full of the promised reward is hardly consistent with mere gratified revenge. Even by the method which she herself proposed she might have put both men out of the way as easily as one. She would not have scrupled to do so if she had felt inclined.

In other words, we have reason to suspect, even from the story itself, that Plato's statement regarding Gyges' relations to the queen represented some incident in the version which Herodotos had before him. His reasons for omitting it have already been stated.

But this is not all. It will be remembered that the reason why Gyges went to his memorable interview without suspicion was because, according to Herodotos, "he had previously been in the habit of going to the queen whenever she sent for him." Certainly this detail, at least as Herodotos states it, is inconsistent with the strictly guarded seclusion of an oriental palace. The Lydians can hardly have differed much in this respect from their

¹ It is possible that we have here a trace of the Delphian tradition which, for the best of reasons, was favorable to Gyges and his queen.

² Also stated by Xanthos, as we have seen, and, quite possibly, a historical fact.

modern representatives. Of course, this inconsistency, such as it is, may not be due to rationalization. But, in any case, it disappears as soon as we return to Gyges his magic ring. Equipped with this, he could indeed "go to the queen whenever she sent for him." Not only that, but the passing comment of Herodotos now assumes quite another meaning. In fact, it can only be associated with the statement of Plato regarding Gyges' relations to the queen before the death of Kandaules. The importance of this point is easy to see. The restoration of the ring of darkness to what seemed to be a scar in the Herodotean narrative has in fact served a double purpose. It has removed what seemed to be a slight inconsistency due to rationalization, and at the same time revealed and explained the one point in which it may be positively affirmed that Herodotos differs from Plato, and, therefore, from the folk-tale. It also goes far to justify our assumption that Herodotos did have the original of Plato's narrative before him, and that rationalization was at least one of the processes which he applied. We can now see why Herodotos omitted the first half of the story. It dealt almost entirely with the marvellous. For the same reason, as well as for those already given, the queen's love affair was also omitted. As soon as the element of marvel was removed—the manifestly incredible element—this episode appeared to have no reason for existence. Thus the author was, in so far, convinced that the favorable opinion of Gyges and the queen, which was doubtless maintained by the Delphian tradition, was justified by the essential residuum of fact in the popular legend.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

III.—ΘΕΤΙΚΩΤΕΡΟΝ.

CICERO AD QUINTUM FRATREM III 3, 4.

The passage reads thus: „Cicero tuus nosterque (the son of Quintus) summo studio est Paeonii sui rhetoris (probably a domestic appointment), hominis, opinor, valde exercitati et boni. Sed nostrum instituendi genus esse paulo eruditius et *θετικώτερον* non ignoras. Quare neque ego impediri Ciceronis iter atque illam disciplinam volo, et ipse puer (young Quintus) magis illo declamatorio genere duci et delectari videtur. In quo quoniam ipsi quoque [cf. Brutus 305; commentabar „declamitans,” sic enim nunc (46 B. C.) loquuntur, Brut. 310] fuimus, patiamur illum ire nostris itineribus; eodem enim perventurum esse confidimus. Sed tamen, si nobiscum eum rus aliquo eduxerimus, in hanc nostram rationem consuetudinemque inducemus.”

Professor Tyrrell's elaborate edition of six volumes—a cyclopedic work on a body of texts which in the infinite detail of their data may fairly be called Cyclopean—Professor Tyrrell's edition (vol. II, p. 161) gives this note: „The epithet *θετικώτερον* indicates a style of speaking more adapted for a judge than a jury, more addressed to the reason than the feelings.”

Tyrrell's note is palpably inadequate and vague. And it need not be. For we are dealing with a technical and therefore definite matter than which none was more familiar to the writer who had not long before completed his three books de Oratore, which, by the by, had been dedicated to his present correspondent, his brother Quintus. The letter was written probably pretty late in the fall of 54, preceding the fateful winter [to Quintus,] of 54-53, [cf. Caesar B. G. V 39-52].

The editors of Cicero's letters in the main seem to have carried *θετικώτερον* as a strange and odd thing. The editio princeps, Rome, 1470, read *τετιχώτερον*, possibly as taken down from dictation by some one who understood no Greek, beyond the script. Paulus Manutius (Venice, 1544) in the text p. 326, b reads *θετικώτερον*, but in the appendix (Graeca Latinis expressa) he has „*τεχνικώτερον*, artificiosius”: taken from Cratander, the printer-scholar of Basle

(1528): an emendation which sprung from Cratander's failure to understand *θετικώτερον*. The Leyden edition of 1692 vol. XI, in its Index Graeco-Latinus defines *θετικώτερον* not badly as „philosophicis quaestionibus magis refertum, aptum” and so reprinted in the Amsterdam edition of 1724, vol. XI, p. 21. Ernesti, the noted Ciceronian of Leipzig [1707-1781]—his first edition was 1737-1739—defined *θετικώτερον* as, *subtilius*, *φιλολογώτερον* (sic), *magis ex arte disserendi dialectica*. Of course we must not confound the „sospitator Ciceronis” as Ruhnken and Wytttenbach called him, (Johann August E.) with the excellent student of rhetorical *τεχνολογία* (Johann Christian Gottlieb E., 1756-1802). If the latter had commented on ad Q. Fr. 3, 3, 4, he would have given more specific elucidation than his uncle gave. The latter's gloss passed over into Orelli-Baiter, VIII, p. 51: *θ.*, *subtilius*, *magis ex arte dialectica*. Wieland whose good taste and sanity often render his version of Cicero's letters (Zürich, 1808, sqq. XII vols.) valuable, satisfied himself with a vague paraphrase: „tiefer in die Geheimnisse der Kunst eingeht.” Besides, W. took „Ciceronis iter atque illam disciplinam” as „Reise” deines Sohnes [und der Fortsetzung seines bisherigen Unterrichtes etwas in den Weg gelegt würde] whereas the context a little further on [patiamur illum ire nostris itineribus] shows that 'course' [*μέθοδος*] was meant. Billerbeck [letters, vol. I 1836, p. 523] writes: *θετικώτερον*: „*subtilius*, gründlicher, tiefer in die Grundsätze der Kunst eingehend”—clearly copying Wieland, though for „Reise” Billerbeck very properly substitutes „bisherigen Gang” („iter atque disciplinam eius, hendiadys.”) Hoffa (1843) blends the gloss of the Leyden edition of 1692 and of Ernesti.

2.

Let us now secure a closer vision, if we can, of the situation involved. Young Quintus Cicero was the first Cicero of the coming generation. He was, in October 54 not more than thirteen years old, barely that (cf. Att. I 10, 5) having been born either late in 67 or in the early part of 66. The transition from *grammaticus* to *rhetor* had, it would seem, but recently been made. The *grammaticus*, as it seems, was the noted scholar Tyrannio the Elder,¹ originally called *Θεόφραστος*, but renamed T. for his

¹ Of him H. Usener treats in detail: Ein altes Lehrgebäude der Philologie, Munich Acad. 1892, p. 635 sqq. As Atticus read a work dedicated to Atticus

manner in running down (κατατρέχων, Suidas) his professional colleagues in the profession of γραμματική. It is not likely that the Cicero-lads failed to learn Greek grammar and literature under such a master.¹ At least Tyrannio taught young Quintus in the winter of 56-55. Cic. Q. Fr. II 4, 2: „Q. tuus, puer optimus, eruditur egregie. Hoc nunc magis animum adverto, quod Tyrannio docet apud me.”

Both the grammaticus then and the rhetor as well were Greek professionals. Cicero in the autumn of 54 was for the first time in the position of taking an interest in the practical introduction of a youth of his near kin into the theory and practice of rhetoric. In 55 Cicero had been engaged with his ‘de Oratore’ and well on in 54 he still justifies himself to Atticus for certain data of literary manipulation in the construction of that dialogue, [ad Att. IV 16, 3.] and it would seem that the 3 books, their subject-matter and economy were a fairly recent matter between the two friends. If we then can secure some illumination on θετικώτερον from de Oratore we will naturally first turn to it.

3.

There are contained in the text (ad Q. Fr. III 3, 4) which we have placed at the head of this article, three distinct matters:

1) nostrum instituendi genus, i. e. not the way in which Cicero was trained in his own youth, but the mode which Cicero in 55-54 claimed rhetorical training should be carried on, i. e. the θετικώτερον and ‘eruditius.’

2) illud declamatorium genus, the mode of the Greek rhetor Paionios.

3) the mode of Cicero’s own youth, which he admits to have been substantially identical with no. 2. And we may note that Cicero here does not, in referring to genus 2 and 3, indulge in the contemptuous *istud*,² but uses the dispassionate *illud*, (the current, familiar, well-known, even well-known to his brother Quintus who cared nothing at all for the technique of rhetoric.)³ What then

by this Tyrannio in 46, it is reasonably certain that the elder Tyrannio who was brought to Rome by Lucullus, was the teacher of young Quintus. Suidas, it seems, has confusedly allotted the works of Tyrannio I in the main to Tyrannio II.

¹ διαπρεπήν δὲ γενόμενος ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ πλοῦσιος (Suidas).

² Cf. de Or. III 188, quia non traduntur in *volgari ista* disciplina.

³ Vide pref. of II de Orat.

was no. 2., illud declamatorium genus, the current mode of the *rhetoires*? Of course, Cicero did not wish to displace the τέχνη itself: the bare catechism which he composed, later on, for his own son Marcus, probably before the latter went away to Athens, [i. e. the 'Partitiones Oratoriae']¹ proves that most exhaustively. What, indeed, was Cicero's attitude to the professional 'rhetorici' in 55-54,—the „rhetorici doctores” of de Or. I 87? You cannot find in their manuals the requisites or elements of the moral training of youth (ib. § 85); no author of a manual is eloquent himself (ib. 91) a note which is re-echoed further on (de Or. II 75: nec mihi opus est Graeco aliquo doctore qui mihi *pervolgata praecepta decantet*, cum ipse nunquam forum, nunquam ullum iudicium aspexerit.) The grasp and comprehension of a real, actual case is not taught in the schools (de Or. II 100) and now we are brought upon the trace of our question: “*faciles enim causae ad pueros deferuntur*” (i. e. by the rhetor: *defero* like *trado* = *docentur*): „Lex² peregrinum vetat in murum ascendere; ascendit; hostis reppulit: accusatur.” This is a typical *causa*, i. e. not an abstract disquisition but a concrete, though fictitious, case, the pupil either speaking (*declamare*) on both sides, or being opposed by a fellow-pupil. It was *after* Cicero's time that for these fictitious *causae* there was substituted the term of *controversia*, so familiar to the readers of Seneca rhetor, which differs much from the two examples quoted in full by Suetonius in the latter part of his chapter de Rhetoribus.

But we may well note here, (the more so as it has not, as far as I can see been generally noted before³) that not only do we observe a substantial identity in the presentation of *στάσις* by the Roman Hermagorean translator and follower Cornificius, of the time of Sulla, with that of the Greek Hermogenes of Tarsos of the time of the emperor Marcus—but also that the very examples (*παράδειγματα*) were handed down in the manuals and thus in the schools, with a puzzling and extraordinary degree of persistency and sameness. And these examples it seems furnished

¹ Cf. the Berlin Dr. diss., by John F. Merchant, 1890, de Ciceronis Part. Orat. Commentatio.

² Quintil. 7, 6, 6 Peregrinus, si murum ascenderit, capite puniatur. Cum hostes murum ascendissent, peregrinus eos depulit. Petitur ad supplicium. Cf. Hermogenes, p. 140 ξένος ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος εἰ ἀνέλθοι, τεθνάτω· πολιορκίας οὐσης ἀνελθόν τις ἡρίστευσσε, καὶ ἐπάγεται τῷ νόμῳ.

³ Cf. however Spalding on Quint. 7, 6, 6.

also the themes for *declamationes*, being either fictitious *causae* (*ὑποθέσεις*), or sometimes indeed taken from mythology or history; or the tradition of the department itself furnished the subject-matter, the aim of the *ῥητορικός* who devised the particular *πλάσμα* being to afford fairly equal opportunity to prosecution and defense. So Cicero in his youthful performance de *Inventione* (of 82 or so B. C.) II 55, „ut, si quaeratur, fur sit an sacrilegus, *qui vasa ex privato sacra surripuerit*” which recurs in Hermogenes, (some two hundred and fifty years later) *περὶ στάσεων* (p. 154, Sp.) *ὅταν ὄνομα ὀνόματι ὁ φεύγων ἀντιτιθῇ, οἷον ὑφείλετό τις ἐξ ἱεροῦ ἰδιωτικὰ χρήματα καὶ ὡς ἱερόσυλος ὑπάγεται. . . .* Both examples—or rather this *one* example—occur in both cases in the elucidation of the *constitutio* (status) *definitiva*, i. e. the *στάσις ὁριστική*. Another example exhibiting this remarkable conservatism in the tradition of *τέχνη* whether it was transmitted by Greek or Roman hands: the type of cases is that called *de Ambiguo* (*περὶ ἀμφιβολίας*) when the point at issue in the trial (*τὸ κρινόμενον, de qua re agitur*, Cic. Top. 95) is a word or phrase liable to a double sense or interpretation. Cicero de *Invent.* II 118 MERETRIX CORONAM AUREAM NE HABETO; SI HABUERIT, PUBLICA ESTO (the woman or the corona?) and so in Hermogenes p. 173: *ἑταῖρα χρυσία εἰ φοροίη, ΔΗΜΟΣΙΑ ἔστω* (Query: the woman or the golden ornaments: *δημοσία* or *δημόσια*, which of these two does the statute mean?). Another theme of the schools: Cic. de *Inv.* II 153: [„statute”, perhaps originally from Rhodian Law¹ de *Iactu*] *Qui in adversa tempestate navem reliquerint, omnia amittunt; eorum naves et onera sunt, qui in nave remanserint.* Cf. Hermogenes p. 169: *ὁ ἐπιμείνας χειμαζομένην νηὶ δεσπότης ἔστω τῆς νεώς.* Such were the themes which illustrated the position assumed by the pleader in the various categories of *causae*: on these it seems and similar ones Paionios had young Quintus Cicero exercise himself in *declamatio*.

A little more light as to Cicero's dissatisfaction with current methods (55 B. C.) of rhetorical training we may derive from de Or. I 149. Here Cicero describes the *ὑπόθεσις* of the schools: *ut, causa aliqua posita consimili causarum earum quae in forum deferuntur dicatis quam maxime ad veritatem adcommode*: but while he fairly approves of this subject-matter, he does find fault with the manner of the rhetors: they make of this exercise,

¹ Cf. Justin. Digest XIV, t. 2.

in the main, a *tour de force*, as far as vocal delivery is concerned, and that too not very cleverly: they further strive for nimbleness of expression, a *presto* of delivery, and a great array of words.

4

We have briefly surveyed the negative side of Cicero's professional opinion on rhetorical methods of instruction. We will now turn to the positive side—*θετικώτερον*, i. e., a way in which the *θίσις* predominates. Over what? Why over these fictitious *causae*, over the *ὑπόθεσις*. What was *θίσις*¹ in the tradition of rhetorical *τέχνη*? In his youthful Latinization—partial at that—of Greek *τέχνη* we learn that Hermagoras had made—on the very threshold of his exposition—the subject-matter of oratory (*oratoris materia*, Cic. Inv. I 8) consist of two things: either *ὑπόθεσις* or *θίσις*: Cicero translates *causa* and *quaestio*: the former a concrete or quasi concrete *case*, with the appurtenances of persons, names, places, circumstances. *θίσις* on the other hand = *quaestio*: generally with the epithet of *infinita*, [i. e. non-concrete, abstract], involves the putting of a problem, and the solution thereof. E. g. „*ecquid sit bonum praeter honestatem?*” Evidently a Stoic thesis, for there is a strong flavor of Stoicism in our tradition of Hermagoras as Volkmann has duly pointed out. „*Verine sint sensus?*” „*Quae sit mundi forma?*” „*Quae sit solis magnitudo?*”—(a traditional problem as between the Stoics and Epicureans). Of course, said young Cicero in 83–82 B. C. these themes are utterly foreign to the duty (*officium*, ib. Inv. I 8) of the orator. *θετικώτερον*, consequently, would mean: dealing more with the discussion of abstract problems, and the epithet *eruditius* is significant enough now, not at all unmeaning—because these *θίσεις* were, in the main, problems from the sphere of philosophy.

The question arises, and we will attempt to answer it in accordance with the measure of the data of tradition: Can we know anything about *θίσις* that antedates Hermagoras?

We may safely say that *θίσις* came into professional rhetoric out of Aristotle's professional initiative and largely through his greatest pupil and successor, Theophrastos (Tyrtamos). Bonitz in his concordance, p. 327, col. 2 under 4, adduces a great number of pertinent passages of which we may quote a single one: *θίσις*

¹ Cf. also Volkmann's earlier book, Hermagoras, 1865, pp. 13–14.

ἐστὶν ὑπόληψις παράδοξος τῶν γνωρίμων τινὸς κατὰ φιλοσοφίαν, Aristotle, *Topica* I, 11;—πρόβλημα, as Aristotle discriminates in the same chapter, a little further on, is a somewhat wider and more comprehensive term: *θέσις* indeed is a πρόβλημα, but not every πρόβλημα is a *θέσις*, for there are some προβλήματα about which we entertain neutral opinion (οὐδετέρως δοξάζομεν). Thesis consequently is a proposition calling for a positive solution either negatively or affirmatively. Inspecting the list of Aristotle's works¹ in Diogenes L. V 1, 12 we find a number of titles of works which, like the *Topica* are of that class which we may call logico-rhetorical: as 7 bb. *ἑροὶ πρὸ τῶν τοπικῶν*, 2 bb. *Ἐπιχειρημάτων, θέσεις ἐπιχειρηματικαὶ πέντε καὶ εἴκοσι*, *Ἐνθυμήματα ῥητορικά, περὶ μεγέθους* 1 b., *Ἐνθυμημάτων διαιρέσεις* 1 b.: this list is arranged according to materials. When we proceed from the great master to the great disciple, Theophrastos, this element of rhetorical training is even more conspicuous and extensive. The list in Diog. L. V 2, 13 sqq. is, in the main, alphabetical.² We find *θέσεις* κδ twenty-four books, *Τοπικά* 2 bb., also *περὶ ψυχῆς θέσις μία*; *προβλήματα πολιτικά, ἠθικά, φυσικά, ἐρωτικά* 1 b.; *Ἐπιχειρημάτων* 2 bb., *θέσεις* 3 bb.;—Perhaps the *θέσεις* κδ twenty-four books were an alphabetical arrangement according to subject-matter. The enormous production of didactic material by Aristotle and Theophrastos would seem to have had the result so frequently recorded in analogous spheres: it smothered or checked further production along these lines and furnished and equipped the subsequent tradition.

Whom did Quintilian mean by '*antiqui*' in II 1, 9 when in his retrospect of former modes of rhetorical training he says: *An ignoramus antiquis hoc fuisse ad augendam eloquentiam genus exercitationis, ut theses dicerent et communes locos et cetera citra complexum rerum personarumque (i. e. abstract themes) quibus verae fictaeque controversiae continentur?* We see Quintilian differentiates the traditional *θέσις* from the traditional *ὑπόθεσις*. Of course Quintilian cannot mean the Roman era of Cato or even of the Gracchi by *antiqui* in this passage. Further it is a well established fact, reflected, e. g. in Suetonius de Rhetoribus c. 1, and brought out by Cicero himself, de Orat. passim, that theoretical rhetoric in the Greek fashion was Latinized or taught in Latin not

¹ A list which E. Heitz, (*Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles* p. 17.) declares to be incomplete.

² Really *two* alphab. lists, with an epimetrum.

earlier than about 92 B. C., in the last years of the great orator Crassus.

At that time the system of Hermagoras dominated the schools opened in Rome. Now, then, Cicero at the height of his powers makes it a distinct count against the professional 'artium scriptores' de Or. II 78 that while giving the general subdivision of *inóthesis* and *thesis* they limit their 'praecepta' to the former, and have nothing to aid the student in *thesis*. „De causa praecepta dant; de altera parte dicendi mirum silentium est." Now then we must not forget that Cicero in the mature rhetorical writings (from 55-44 B. C.) strove to gain, or for theoretical and practical rhetoric to *regain* the position of Aristotle and Theophrastos, the detailed proof of which I need not and must not adduce here. The blending of philosophy and rhetoric was his goal in all that decade of his production.

In III de Or. 109 Cicero returns¹ to this favorite matter which he had so much at heart, the elaboration of the abstract theme, ascribing its establishment to the Peripatetic and the Academic schools and he goes on [in § 110] to censure the 'rhetores' for their professional practice of contenting themselves with the merest perfunctory mentioning of *thesis*; they merely name it on the very threshold of their system and then let it severely alone, without setting forth its force and nature, its species² and genera, so that it would have been better to have it passed over altogether rather than merely touched upon and then abandoned.

In the last stage of his theoretical books on rhetoric (46-44 B. C.) Cicero seems to have turned even more clearly and positively towards *thesis*, as he strengthened his hold on Aristotle and Theophrastos: thus in Or. § 46: „haec igitur quaestio a propriis personis et temporibus ad *universi generis rationem* traducta appellatur *thesis*. In hac Aristoteles adulescentis³ non ad philosophorum morem *tenuiter* disserendi, sed ad copiam rhetorum in utramque partem exercuit." This then was the mode which Cicero wished to have adopted in the rhetorical training of his nephew Quintus. In the very last of his rhetorical writings (the

¹ The books de Orat. abound in iterations. No standard of exact, successive, strictly didactic exposition must be rigidly applied to this distinguished work. The accomplished master of oratory urges and reiterates his point of view, tested by his great and splendid career at the bar.

² *Partes* is Cicero's technical word for species.

³ With O. Iahn's note.

Topica of the dog-days of 44 B. C.) Cicero presents a fairly full, didactic survey of *thesis*: he had already abandoned, in the *Partitiones oratoriae* 62 the Latinization of his earlier books and selected for *thesis*: *propositum*. He had gone on to distinguish two general classes of abstract themes: 1) of knowledge, 2) of action,¹ a theoretical and a practical group of abstract problems: (cuius genera sunt duo, cognitionis alterum; eius scientia est finis, ut, *verine sint sensus*:² alterum actionis; quod refertur ad efficiendum quid, ut, si quaeratur quibus officiis amicitia quaerenda sit. The practical group is subdivided: (63) actionis autem duo sunt genera: unum, ad persequendum aliquid aut declinandum . . . , alterum, quod ad aliquam commoditatem usumque refertur . . . Substantially then this same doctrine is repeated in the Topica 79 sqq. The *propositum* (*thesis*) is a *pars* (an intrinsic element) *causae* (of the concrete case at bar): follows the classification of theoretical and practical abstract themes as above—*causa efficiens* indeed points more directly to Aristotle.

In Aristotle's Topica I 11, we have the same general classification into theoretical and practical subjects: the former merely or mainly satisfying the desire for knowledge, the latter guiding action: Πρόβλημα δ' ἐστὶ διαλεκτικὸν θεώρημα τὸ συντεῖνον ἢ πρὸς αἵρεσιν καὶ φυγὴν ἢ πρὸς ἀλήθειαν καὶ γνῶσιν: it is not necessary to urge the resemblance. And so too Theon whose time was probably a little earlier than that of Hermogenes (Marcus Aurelius) devoting the 12th chapter of his Προγυμνάσματα to *thesis* defines it substantially in the same manner and goes on (Spengel, vol. II, p. 121) to discriminate between the same two groups: αἱ μὲν εἰσι θεωρητικαί, ὅσα θεωρίας ἔνεκα καὶ γνώσεως μόνον ζητοῦνται, οἷον εἰ θεοὶ προνοοῦνται τοῦ κόσμου, αἱ δὲ πρακτικαὶ εἰς τινα πρᾶξιν τὴν ἀναφορὰν ἔχουσιν, οἷον εἰ γαμητίον The theoretical themes he goes on to say belong rather to philosophers, the practical to oratory proper . . . Quintilian by the by (II 4, 25) reveals the substantial iteration in the professional tradition: 'ducendane uxor,' 'petendine sint magistratus.'

Hermogenes the 'Wunderkind' of Tarsos, who with his extraordinary receptive faculty seems to have had in the main Hermagoras as his quarry if not as his very mirror, and who most naturally, after a tremendous amount of production which

¹ Quintil. III 5, 11 distinguishes the *spectativa* *pars* from the *activa* *pars*.

² Precisely the same example as in the youthful De Invent. I 8, in exactly the same form, too.

was merely reproduction, became a hopeless imbecile at twenty-four¹—Hermogenes (*Προγυμνάσματα*, Spengel, vol. 2, p. 17 sq. *περὶ θέσεως*) has all the preceding doctrine without any perceptible variation: among the examples: *εἰ γαμητέον, εἰ σφαιροειδὴς ὁ κόσμος, εἰ πολλοὶ κόσμοι, εἰ ὁ ἥλιος πῦρ*, etc., etc. But, to cap and crown all, Cicero himself has written a large number of titles of *θέσεις*, not at all in a playful vein, and still in his characteristic mixture of profound perplexity in practical politics with theoretical interests and favorite professional pursuits, Att. IX 4. (= Tyrrell vol. IV no. 361) written as his Formianum (March 12, 49 B. C.). The very introductory words seem to reverberate the technical habits of the writer's mind: „Sed tamen, ne me totum aegritudini dedam, sumpsi mihi quasdam tamquam *θέσεις* quae et πολιτικά² sunt et temporum horum, ut et abducam animum ab querellis et in eo ipso, de quo agitur, exercere. Eae sunt huiusmodi.”

εἰ μενετέον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι τυραννουμένη etc. without mentioning the name of Caesar, or Rome or Pompey, the Optimates, his own services in the Catilinarian affair, the urgent provision for his own family—and still discussing all these problems in the abstract manner³—*θετικώτερον* indeed. The grammatical form is uniform: *εἰ μενετέον—εἰ . . . πραγματευτέον, εἰ πειρατέον . . . ; εἰ πολιτικὸν τὸ ἡσυχάζειν . . . , ἢ . . . ἰτέον; εἰ πόλεμον ἐπακτέον . . . καὶ πολιορκητέον . . . ; εἰ . . . συναπογραπτέον τοῖς ἀρίστοις; εἰ . . . συγκινδυνευτέον*; with this one variation: *εἰ ὁ μέγαρα τὴν πατρίδα εὐεργετήσας* (i. e. Cicero) . . . *κινδυνεύσειεν ἂν . . . ἢ ἐφετέον . . .* „In his ego me consultationibus exercens et disserens in utramque partem tum Graece tum Latine et abduco parumper animum a molestiis et τῶν προδργων τι delibero.” Few passages in his extant writings so clearly exhibit the idiosyncrasy of the extraordinary man: the restlessness, the galling sense of political impotency, the eagerness of the foremost patronus to keep on training, and that too, consciously, with an appropriation of Theophrastean method and manner.⁴

If we knew no more of Cicero's professional preference for *θέσεις* we could ourselves write what Quintilian wrote 10, 5, 11, „infinite quæstiones, quas vocari *θέσεις* diximus, quibus Cicero iam princeps in republica exerceri solebat.” But Quintilian could

¹ Suidas, s. v.

² Perhaps *πρακτικά*.

³ Cf. Top. 84 once only in this manner: „*si expetendae divitiæ, si fugienda paupertas.*”

⁴ Cf. the survey of 44, B. C. De Div. II 1, 4. Cumque Aristoteles itemque Theophrastus, etc.

know more than we can know: it is not at all improbable that Tiro his *libertus amanuensis* to whom Cicero dictated so much and who was his literary confidant, recorded data of this kind in his (we do not know how many) *Libri de vita M. Tullii Ciceronis*.

5

In conclusion we ask—and we cannot very well help asking—what did Cicero strive for in this practical and technical emphasis laid by him on *thesis*? We may cite for this ascending from concrete 'causa' to the abstract *thesis* which contained the real merits of the case in hand, de Or. III 120 sq., Or. 45 sq., Or. 126, Part. 103. He claims that this dwelling on the abstract underlying truth, the principle involved, affords far greater freedom of elaboration of oratory on the side of manner and style too, it allowed far better and greater fitness in the end, to jurors, to reach a verdict. It permitted a greater range of presentation and argument, it broke down the narrow limits of strict adherence to the specific questions involved, it afforded Cicero the chance to be himself—to combine culture and dialectic—philosophy in a word, with the narrower sphere of *τέχνη* (de Orat. III 120 sqq.). Even more specific if possible is what he wrote some ten years later (Or. 45 sq.) in outlining „*excellentis eloquentiae speciem et formam*” The eminent orator then, in order to really avail himself of the current discrimination of the various kinds of *status*, must always move the pleading away from specific persons and times, i. e., resort to the analysis of the abstract elements immanent in or relevant to the case. Why? *LATIUS* enim de genere quam de parte¹ disceptare licet: i. e. the discussion may take a much wider range when it deals with generic truth than when it deals with the specific law-point of the case.

To this matter he returns in the same dialogue further on 125, where he calls the elaboration of *thesis* one of the two factors [in an oration] particularly luminous and forceful. On the *thesis* often entire cases depend, excepting in those where the question of *fact* is the central element.² At the same time he again reverts to Aristotle's didactic practice in his rhetorical instruction.

Tersely and drily he presents the same matter in the manual written for his son Marcus (Part. 61, sqq.)—*sed est propositum* (i. e.

¹ *Genus* and *pars* are Cicero's Latinizations of *γένος* and *εἶδος*.

² *Status coniecturalis*.

dius) quasi LATIOR pars causae: i. e. a principle inherent in the concrete case at bar. Thus we may add, by way of illustration, Cicero in the very finished pro Milone elaborated in his exordium the principle of self-defense, § 7 sqq., in his pro Archia dwelt upon the intrinsic as well as relative value of literary culture, in the pro Murena with exquisite skill and grace elucidated the relative value and standing of military distinction as over against the fame of the civilian lawyer. It is therefore a conscious and, consequently to the student, a doubly significant element in his professional and literary ideals, and I trust that the foregoing exposition may justify itself to students of Latin Literature and Ancient Rhetoric.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.

E. G. SIHLER.

IV.—THE ABLATIVE ABSOLUTE IN LIVY.

I.

The number of occurrences of the ablative absolute in Livy can not be definitely determined, for texts and interpretations vary, as all do not see the relationship of words in the same way. These considerations do not affect very many passages, but the impossibility of reaching exact results can be shown by two examples. Ad 21, 49, 8 are given the following forms of the verb: *missi* Wfsb., *missis* Mg., *dimissi* Hwg., *dimissis* Wfl., *dimitti* Harant, *missi milites* Hasenmüller. Differences in interpretation can be seen in comparing explanations of *persecutis hostibus* 3, 42, 3, which in the Weissenborn-Müller 7th edition is called a dative, against earlier editions and the Woelfflin-Luterbacher 4th edition ad 21, 36, 7. We have collected from the Weissenborn-Müller edition 6457 examples, counting as one, two nouns with one participle, or two participles with one noun. This number may be considered as sufficiently exact for all practical purposes, but it might be increased by the addition of a few instances where, if the construction changes, the abl. abs. occurs, e. g. 5, 18, 5 quaeso . . . delatum mihi ultro honorem huic petenti meisque pro eo adiectis precibus mandetis, where the latter part is a variation in phraseology for *mihi* which is used in the first of the sentence. On the other hand the number might be reduced by striking out a few which may be taken as ablatives of quality, e. g. 3, 60, 10 adortusque nec omnes dum eductos nec, qui erant, satis explicatis ordinibus, which we have taken as an abl. abs., looking at the process rather than at the result. However, examples of this kind are but a very small part of the entire number which is affected chiefly by the interpretation given to three classes of constructions: 1. Gerundive forms, 2. Certain plurals of the present participle, 3. Some ablative forms of the neuter participle.

1. If we accept the extremes of interpretation both the active and the passive of three participles are found in the ablative absolute. But the few examples of the future passive do not differ

from those which are classed as present passive, and these in turn may be taken as a free use of the modal ablative of the gerund or gerundive, so that by interpretation these two passives may be eliminated. We have taken the interpretation which gives for Livy the least number of ablatives absolute, though this conclusion does not find support in all quarters, as may be seen from the following.

Zumpt, Latin Grammar §643, after giving some instances of the abl. abs. of the future passive, quotes from Livy, 5, 43, 7 *cum diis hominibusque accusandis senesceret*; 21, 2, 1 *ita se Africo bello . . . in Hispania augendo Punico imperio gessit*; and 33, 3, 5 *exercendo cotidie milite hostem opperiebatur*. Helm, *Quaestiones Syntacticae de Participiorum usu* Tacitino Velleiano Sallustiano, p. 104-5 argues for the same construction in Tacitus, *Annals* 3, 19 and 14, 4, in all of which, however, the ablative expresses the coincident limitation of the main action, and the forms should be considered as ablatives of the gerundive, though this is not the interpretation given by all critics to similar passages in Livy. Kühnast *Liv. Syn.*, p. 256-7 says "Tritt aber das Gerundium oder Gerundiv bei L. sonst unabhängig von der Zeit des Hauptverbs auf. . . mag man es als Abl. instr. oder absol. ansehen." Draeger 2, p. 850 classifies similar examples as modal ablatives, quoting among others 3, 39, 7; 4, 29, 3; 5, 43, 7; 24, 36, 1; 28, 14, 11; and 32, 16, 4. It will be interesting to compare with these the statements in the Weissenborn-Müller edition. Ad 3, 39, 7 "quanto fortior dolor libertate sua vindicanda quam cupiditas iniusta dominatione," the reading of a part of the MSS in *libertate . . . in iniusta* is now accepted. Ad 4, 29, 3 "repetendo signo primam impressionem factam," the note is, "*repetendo = eo quod repetebatur* oder *= cum repeteretur*; vgl. 5, 43, 7; zu 2, 32, 4." The comment ad 32, 16, 4 "ad Maleum trahendis . . . navibus . . . pervenit," is, "Abl. abs. mit dem Part. Praes. Pass. = einem Abl. modi." Cf. ad 33, 3, 5 *exercendo milite* "ein Abl. modi (eig. Abl. abs. mit Part. Praes. Pass.); s. 4, 29, 3; 8, 11, 1." As these admit the possibility of the modal ablative as an explanation, they and all similar examples have been classed as gerundives.

2. When the participle is used in connection with *venire* and its compounds, it may often be taken as a dative or as an ablative. See Weissenborn ad 9, 5, 11; 37, 12, 3; 37, 38, 6. We have assumed that the personal element is stronger than the temporal, and have classed the following as datives: 4, 28, 6 *pedem iam*

referentibus advenit; 9, 5, 11 haec frementibus hora fatalis advenit; (21, 57, 3 perf.); 31, 41, 10 Philippus inopinantibus advenit; 37, 38, 6 metantibus et muniendo occupatis . . . advenere. 1, 48, 9 ni scelus . . . agitantibus intervenisset; 9, 14, 1; (10, 12, 5 *incertis*); 37, 12, 3 haec agentibus cum intervenisset nuntius; cf. 40, 9, 7 mihi quiritantibus intervenisses. 10, 29, 5 superveniunt deinde his restituentibus pugnam; 24, 35, 9; 28, 7, 7; 30, 14, 3; 34, 29, 4; 36, 10, 6; 36, 21, 7; 36, 29, 11 ita datis qui . . . Nicander consultantibus supervenit; (37, 32, 8 *intentis*); 42, 56, 5 parantibus iam oppugnare supervenit praetor. 32, 6, 4 has "hoc consilium per multos dies agitantibus ei nuntius venit," and for that reason we have taken as a dative 29, 4, 3 iam haec agitantibus nuntius tandem venit. In 22, 61, 6 morantibus . . . venisse, the participle is an abl. abs., as the relation of the parties is not the same as in the other examples. There are a few instances, however, in which these verbs are used with the abl. abs.: 24, 41, 2 dubiis sociorum animis in tempore advenisset; 36, 44, 11 commisso certamine advenerat; 31, 25, 2 inopinantibus Achaeis contioni ipsi supervenit; 30, 12, 21 factis nuptiis supervenit Laelius. In the last the completion of the act expressed in the abl. abs. prevents its use as the dative, and in the next to the last, the indirect object of the verb is expressed by another dative.

There are numerous instances in which the plural of the present participle stands alone, and at times the interpretation varies between the ablative absolute and the dative dependent on some expression in the sentence. In 37, 1, 6 exprimere cupientibus, quarum rerum in se arbitrium senatui permetterent, nihil certi responsum est, the words seem to be based directly on the words of Polybius 21, 1, 5 τῶν δ' Αἰτωλῶν ἀξιούντων διασαφῆσαι ῥητῶς ἐπὶ τίσι δέῃ δίδόναι τὴν ἐπιτροπὴν. If the Greek decides the construction for Livy, in a few other passages formally indeterminate, the ablative absolute might be assumed as the construction for Livy, e. g. 5, 15, 9 sciscitantibus quidnam id esset . . . respondit; 31, 28, 2 pollicentibus auxilia respondit consul; 41, 2, 6 nec percunctantibus reddere responsum poterant; and similar to these, 42, 26, 5 haesitantibus in responso . . . dictum; 10, 25, 6 respondentibusque lignatum se ire "ain tandem?" inquit . . .; 3, 50, 4 quaerentibus, quid rei esset, flens diu vocem non misit, which is a variation for *respondit*. Notwithstanding the construction in the passage from Polybius, these and all similar examples have been counted as datives, as have passages similar to 1, 23, 10 quaerentibus utrimque

ratio initur; and 23, 10, 9 haec vociferanti (e) obvolutum caput est, although the ablative absolute occurs in 25, 9, 13 cum excitasset vigilem dicente vix sustineri grandis bestiae onus, portula aperitur; but here it is directly due to the words of Polybius 8, 31, 6 τοῦ δ' εἰπόντος ἔξωθεν ἀνοίγειν ταχέως, ὅτι βαρύνονται.

3. Draeger 2, pp. 800-2 gives a number of forms as ablatives absolute of the neuter of the perf. pass. participle, and though we shall cite the occurrences which have adverbial force, we have not included the 43 instances in the number of the ablatives absolute. Livy uses some of them both with and without prepositions, and their full adverbial force seems to have been established by his time. If originally absolute, they had become fully parasitic, and were used only as simple verbal modifiers.

NUMBER.

After making the deductions already mentioned, the number counted for the different decades is as follows:

	Perfect.	Present.	Future.	Adjectives.	Nouns.	
Decade 1.	1563	323	1	78	126	2091
" 3.	1547	296	2	104	37	1986
" 4.	1312	250	2	73	46	1683
" 5.	548	100	2	26	21	697
	<hr/> 4970	<hr/> 969	<hr/> 7	<hr/> 281	<hr/> 230	<hr/> 6457

As will be seen, the ablatives absolute are used with about the same frequency in all parts of Livy, though in the first decade the names of officers, owing to the character of the account, are used in the abl. abs. more frequently than in other parts. Under adjectives have been classed those occurrences in which an adjective is used instead of a participle with the noun.

FUTURE PARTICIPLE.

Livy was among the first to use the ablative absolute of the future participle, though the construction is such an innovation as we should expect to find in the Histories of Sallust if they had come down to us entire. Seneca Suas. 6, 24 quotes from Asin. Pollio, huius ergo viri tot tantisque operibus mansuris in omne aevum praedicare de ingenio atque industria superva <cuum est>. It was also used by Pompeius Trogus, if our assumption is correct that the passage in Justinus, 1, 2, 1, tot ac tantis gentibus vix

patienter uni viro, nedum feminae parituris, has been transferred from Trogus to the pages of Justinus. Livy uses it but once in the first decade, 4, 18, 6 nec Etruscis, nisi cogherentur, pugnam inituris, et dictatore arcem Romanam respectante, where *inituris* may be due to the following abl. abs., as also in 28, 15, 13 prima luce oppugnaturis hostibus castra, saxis . . . congestis augent vallum. There is a differentiation of the construction 41, 19, 10 aut metu dedituris se hostibus aut vi expugnaturi, and 31, 36, 6 equitibus extemplo invasuris, is followed by *habiturus* which takes the place of a final clause. *Tamquam* is used with the participle 30, 10, 10 t. exituris contra Romanis; and 36, 41, 1 t. non transi-turis in Asiam Romanis; MSS readings vary 44, 11, 9 aliis parte alia in urbem inrupturis. 45, 35, 6 dederat nihil relicturis, si aviditati indulgeretur, quod in aerarium deferret, given by Koeberlin (De Participiorum Usu Liviano Capita Selecta. Erlangae 1888, p. 53) is to be taken as a dative. Cf. 3, 64, 5 concederet sortem comitiorum collegis habituris e lege potius comitia quam ex voluntate patrum; and 23, 44, 2 an dedituris se Hannibali fuisse accersendum Romanorum praesidium? Comparatively few examples of this construction are found in later writers, though Curtius, as we should expect, followed Livy in this respect. See Reisig-Haase 3, p. 765, N. 589.

DEPONENT VERBS.

The ablative absolute of deponent verbs is found in but a small part of the passages where it is admissible. Of 1751 nominatives of deponent and semi-deponent verbs, the larger part are intransitive—*profectus, ratus, ortus, moratus, lapsus* and the compounds of *gradior*—and of the remainder, about 400 have a dependent noun where the abl. abs. might have been used. Choosing between the two constructions, Livy generally preferred the nominative, and it is easy to parallel his ablatives with the nominative as in 1, 17, 3 regnari omnes volebant libertatis dulcedine nondum experta; and 9, 17, 5 nondum alteram fortunam expertus decessit; 23, 36, 7 perpopulato agro . . . castra locat; and 22, 20, 5 agrum circa depopulati . . . tecta . . . incenderunt. In some of the passages the abl. of the deponent is due to an ablative absolute accompaniment as in 10, 10, 8 qua pacta acceptaque; 21, 21, 2; 23, 1, 4; 9, 36, 13 caesis fugatisque iis late depopulato agro; 4, 44, 10; 4, 53, 1; 22, 60, 9; 29, 35, 4 non agris modo . . . populatis, sed urbibus etiam . . . expugnatis.

In Livy the most commonly occurring are forms of *orior*, *orto* (39) *coorto* (4); and of *morior*, *mortuo*, 1, 32, 1 m. Tullo; 3, 9, 8; 21, 19, 3 vivo eo . . . ne mortuo quidem auctore; 29, 29, 7; 38, 54, 2; 39, 9, 2 mortuis deinde tutoribus; and demortuo 9, 34, 20.

The abl. abs. of verbs of motion without dependent constructions occur with some frequency: *profecto* 22, 24, 1 p. . . ad urbem dictatore; 23, 19, 3; 23, 22, 4; 24, 9, 5; 33, 27, 11 profectis in Italiam Romanis; 36, 37, 1; 42, 18, 6; 42, 36, 8; 44, 20, 1; 44, 32, 10. *egresso* 7, 11, 7 egressis ad opem ferendam Tiburibus; 24, 19, 9; 36, 12, 5; 38, 23, 4; 43, 18, 11; 43, 22, 3. *congresso* 7, 22, 4 c. hoste. *digresso* 21, 61, 5 vixdum d. eo Hasdrubal aderat. *ingresso* 2, 63, 7 consule i. in fines. *regresso* 22, 60, 9 plerisque r. in castra sua; 44, 28, 16. *transgresso* 10, 27, 1 t. Appenino. The abl. abs. of compounds of *lapsus* is found 4, 55, 4 dilapsis ad praedam militibus; 32, 38, 7 paucis . . . elapsis; *prolapsis* 21, 36, 7; 27, 19, 10; 39, 49, 3. *Emenso* is used 43, 21, 9 itinere ingenti emenso. *Persecutis* hostibus 3, 42, 4 can be taken as dative or as an ablative. Cf. 42, 53, 8.

The abls. abs. of other verbs occur as follows: *experto* 1, 17, 3; 2, 29, 1; 28, 34, 3 and 6; 31, 29, 3. *pacto* 8, 24, 8; 10, 5, 12; 10, 10, 8; 34, 19, 8. *partito* 5, 40, 8; 21, 21, 2; 22, 27, 6; 23, 1, 4; 27, 8, 17; 28, 19, 9. *populato* 29, 35, 4; 45, 44, 1. *depopulato* 5, 12, 6; 6, 29, 4; 9, 36, 13; 10, 39, 5; 21, 51, 4; 37, 13, 9; 37, 21, 9. *perpopulato* 22, 9, 2; 23, 36, 7; 26, 9, 11; *nixis* 44, 9, 6; *tribunis ratis* 38, 25, 9; cf. 3, 36, 5.

The earliest example of an acc. dependent on the abl. abs. of a deponent verb is Sall. J. 103, 7 Sulla omnia pollicito, and the construction seems to have won for itself a permanent place. (See Archiv 1, 344). Livy uses *auso* with dependent construction, in connection with another abl. abs. 30, 25, 5 seu clam misso a Carthagine nuntio, uti fieret, seu Hasdrubale, qui classi praeerat, sine publica fraude auso facinus; and 36, 32, 9 adsentienti omni concilio nec Diophane ultra tendere auso Zacynthus Romanis traditur. With deponent verbs 7, 7, 7 conatis equitibus . . . turbare; 1, 29, 6 egressis urbem (?) Albanis; 4, 52, 4 defuncta civitate plurimorum morbis, 4, 44, 10 omnia expertis patribus; 23, 26, 2 inter se partitis copias; 34, 16, 10 regresso Tarraconem consule; 4, 53, 1 Volscis . . . capessentibus arma, voluntariis mercede secutis militiam; 37, 12, 8 multis nobilibus secutis inter cetera auctoritatem Pausistrati; 36, 2, 6 consulibus sortitis provincias; 23, 39, 5 transgresso Volturum Fabio. The two following, 44,

5, 10 circumspectiendi spatium fuit vix tandem ex insperato stabilem ad insistendum nantis locum; and 32, 37, 5 quibus longiorem exorsis orationem brevis interrogatio . . . incidit sermonem, may be taken as datives or as ablatives.

THE NEUTER OF THE PERF. PASS.

The ablative singular of a few adjectives are found (see Draeger 2, p. 808, § 585, 2 b): *dubio* 28, 17, 14; *incerto* 28, 36, 12; *sereno* 31, 12, 5; 37, 3, 3; *tranquillo* 24, 8, 13; 26, 51, 6; 31, 23, 4. The first two of these have a dependent construction, and the second, *incerto prae tenebris quid aut peterent aut vitarent*, is like the instances in which the subject is the omitted antecedent of the following pronominal statement, and with them have been placed a number given by Draeger 2, pp. 800-2. The remaining examples of the neuter singular of the perf. participle in the ablative absolute may be divided into two classes, (1) Those in which the verbal force of the participle is retained, and (2) those which have an adverbial force.

1. *audito* 28, 7, 17; 34, 19, 10. *augurato* 1, 18, 6; 5, 54, 7. *auspicato* 1, 36, 6; 3, 20, 6; 5, 14, 4; 5, 21, 1; 5, 38, 1; 5, 52, 2, 15 and 16; 6, 12, 7; 6, 41, 5, 6 and 10 (four times); 21, 63, 9; 28, 28, 11; 41, 18, 8; 45, 12, 10. *cognito* 33, 41, 5; 37, 13, 5; 44, 28, 4. *comperito* 31, 39, 4 and 7; 33, 5, 4. *debellato* 26, 21, 4; 29, 32, 3; 30, 8, 1. *edicto* 5, 19, 9; 10, 36, 7. *explorato* 23, 42, 9; 23, 43, 7; 27, 2, 12; 31, 2, 7; 32, 15, 5; 38, 18, 7. *palam facto* 22, 55, 3. *impetrato* 9, 16, 5; 9, 30, 10. *inaugurato* 1, 36, 3; 1, 44, 4; 5, 52, 2. *inauspicato* 21, 63, 7. *inexplorato* 6, 30, 4; 21, 25, 9; 22, 4, 4; 26, 3, 4; 27, 26, 6. *lato* 23, 14, 2. *litato* 5, 38, 1. *pacto* 28, 21, 5. *permisso* 6, 25, 5; 34, 31, 1; 38, 10, 2; 45, 5, 3. *submoto* 28, 27, 15; 25, 3, 18; 45, 7, 4.

2. *bipartito* 40, 32, 6. *compecto* 5, 11, 7. *consulto* 3, 38, 12; 3, 40, 8; 5, 10, 7; 9, 44, 4; 26, 19, 6. *directo* 1, 11, 9. *improviso* twenty-four times. *inopinato* 21, 52, 10; 26, 6, 9; 31, 47, 6. *necopinato* 3, 15, 4; 5, 8, 6; 7, 17, 9; 9, 16, 9. *tripertito* 4, 59, 2; 21, 7, 4; 21, 23, 1; 23, 16, 8.

Livy also uses adverbially participles with prepositions, the most important being *ex composito* (32) *ex improviso* (11) *ex insperato* (8) and *ex necopinato* 4, 27, 8; 41, 5, 10; also in Cic. N. D. 2, 48, 123. *Pro dubio* is also used adverbially, and all the examples under 2 may be considered as full fledged adverbs and not as ablatives proper.

AGREEMENT OF SUBJECT AND PARTICIPLE.

The use of two subjects in the singular with a participle in the singular is not uncommon, especially where the nouns are differentiated expressions for a single term, or where the two are very closely related: 2, 54, 1 frumento stipendioque imperato; 24, 7, 6 clamore et tumultu audito; 30, 21, 5 auro argentoque reddito. 1, 27, 4 Mettito exercituque eius ab Alba accito; 3, 26, 10 absterso pulvere ac sudore; 3, 51, 7 auctore Acilio Numitorioque; 22, 22, 16 loco et tempore constituto; 22, 54, 9 consule exercituque amisso; 24, 7, 6 clamore et tumultu audito; 25, 18, 14 parma atque equo relicto; 29, 9, 3 multitudine simul ac tumultu crescente. The subjects stand in an adversative relation 4, 27, 1 relictoque Cn. Iulio consule . . . et L. Iulio magistro equitum. In a few instances the subjects are connected by *et* . . . *et*: 3, 56, 1 fundata deinde et potestate tribunacia et plebis libertate; 4, 61, 9 diruta et arce et urbe Artena. More noticeable than these is a succession of nouns with sing. part.: 44, 23, 5 iure iurando obsidibusque et pecunia accepta; 33, 20, 4 Zephyrio et Solis et Aphrodisiade et Coryco et superato Anemurio; 45, 22, 7 Demetriade et Chalcide et saltu Thermopylarum occupato.

When the subject is made up of a singular and a plural, the participle not uncommonly agrees with the singular next to it: 5, 18, 10 ducibus exercituque caeso; 5, 37, 6 antecedente fama nuntiisque; 5, 39, 10 armisque et frumento conlato; 8, 1, 5 sauciis ac parte impedimentorum relicta; 8, 20, 10 necato Vitruvio sociisque eius; 21, 45, 4 revocato Maharbale atque equitibus; 24, 18, 4 iusso deinde eo ceterisque; 27, 19, 10 armis equoque sumpto; 30, 12, 22 misso Syphace et captivis; 32, 31, 2 relicto duce castrisque; 30, 21, 11 dimisso Laelio legatisque; 33, 34, 7 Thebis Phthioticis et Pharsalo excepta; 41, 12, 7 litteris Ti. Claudii et senatus consulto accepto; 42, 34, 5 devicto Philippo Macedonibusque. Cf. 31, 47, 3 adiuvantibus rege Attalo et Rhodiis. 30, 23, 2 absente consulum altero ambobusve.

One part of the subject is expressed by a relative clause in 24, 1, 9 L. Atilio praefecto praesidii quique cum eo milites Romani erant, clam in portum deductis; 27, 5, 6 exim Muttine et si quorum aliorum merita erga populum Romanum erant, in senatum introductis. For a similar expression see 43, 23, 6 dimissis Chaonumque et si qui alii Epirotae erant praesidiis.

SUBJECT OMITTED.

The subject of the abl. abs. is frequently to be supplied from a following relative whose antecedent is the real subject of the participle.

Perfect.—This is most common with some form of *missis*: 1, 37, 1 *missis qui magnam vim lignorum . . . conicerent*; 29, 30, 11; 31, 45, 3; 32, 24, 7; 32, 26, 7; 34, 38, 1; 36, 12, 4; 37, 17, 4; 39, 34, 10; 40, 49, 5; 43, 18, 6; 44, 23, 9; 44, 35, 2; 45, 32, 8. *dimissis* (22, 7, 5 *captivorum, qui Latini nominis essent, sine pretio dimissis*;) 26, 28, 8; 28, 39, 5; 32, 26, 13; 33, 14, 12; 42, 31, 7 *dimissis si qui parum idonei essent*; 44, 46, 1. *inmissis* 26, 6, 11. *praemissis* 21, 23, 1; 34, 28, 2; 37, 6, 2; 42, 38, 10; 44, 4, 11. With other participles the use is more restricted: *accitis* 4, 46, 12; *collectis* 33, 11, 1; *compulsis* 32, 13, 12. *conlaudatis* 1, 52, 1; 42, 53, 8 *nihil cunctatis qui incolebant*; *datis* 31, 28, 5; 36, 29, 11; 38, 10, 2 *dato qui proficisceretur*; *deiectis* 4, 53, 9; *dissupatis* and also *occulcatis* 27, 14, 7; *relictis quos non idoneos credebat* 29, 24, 13. Cf. 31, 46, 12 *relictis quot satis videbantur*; *submotis* 39, 44, 8 *submotis ab hasta, qui ludificati priorem locationem erant*.

Similar to these, but few in number and with a different set of verbs, are the passages in which the pronoun is neuter. The form most commonly used is *auditis*: 21, 21, 1 *auditis quae Romae quaeque Carthagine acta decretaque forent*; 25, 13, 9; 28, 31, 1; 29, 21, 1; 44, 30, 12. The antecedent of the pronoun is also expressed, e. g. 24, 23, 3 *qui auditis iis quae Syracusis acta erant*. Only single instances of most of the other participles occur: 45, 39, 7 *adapertis forte quae velanda erant*; 44, 19, 2 *cognitis mox quae nosci prius in rem essent*; *direptis* 41, 2, 11; *editis* 44, 45, 10; *expositis* 25, 28, 5; 33, 44, 6 (cf. 42, 21, 7 *is expositis quas in Corsica res gessisset*); *ignotis* 44, 27, 13; *omissis* 36, 43, 3; 40, 39, 5; *peractis* 37, 4, 1; 42, 44, 8; *perfectis* 31, 22, 3; *perpetratis* 24, 11, 1; *raptis* 29, 28, 6; *relatis* 42, 25, 2 *r. ordine quae vidissent quaeque audissent*; *subductis* 42, 27, 1 *s. quae possent usui essent*; and in the singular: 35, 35, 14 *imperato quod res poposcisset*; 22, 20, 6 *quod satis in usum fuit sublato*. The pronominal clause is used with a participle in a complete abl. abs., e. g. 32, 26, 10 *senatu vocato edoctoque quae indices adferrent*.

Instances in which both parts are in the singular are far less

common, and the classification under this head differs from that of Draeger, who places them with the other examples of the ablative absolute of the neuter singular. Exposito 44, 35, 13 e. quid pararet; nuntiato 25, 9, 4 et ne ibi quidem n. quo pergerent; remisso 6, 17, 6 r. id quod erupturi erant.

Iussis in several passages is followed by a relative clause and dependent infinitive: 36, 44 3 iussis qui sequebantur . . . proras derigere; 38, 39, 4 iussis ab Epheso sequi qui ibi relictis erant; 45, 28, 8 iussis qui arguebantur Amphipoli adesse. Cf. 32, 16, 9 Attali adventu audito venit iussis, ut quaeque ex sua classe venissent naves, Euboeam petere.

The present participle also is sometimes followed by a personal relative clause: 2, 10, 7 revocantibus qui rescindebant; 3, 24, 5; 4, 30, 10 novos ritus . . . inferentibus in domos, quibus quaestui sunt capti superstitione animi; 4, 50, 3 increpante qui vulneraverat; 5, 10, 5 invitis conferentibus qui domi remanebant; 5, 40, 2 digredientibus; 24, 18, 14 credentibus; 28, 29, 11 torpentibus; 28, 30, 4 qui eam rem pollicerentur in castra venientibus; 29, 9, 2 sequentibus quorum fuit; 30, 37, 11 adversantibus; 31, 37, 7 dantibus; 34, 39, 10 adiuvantibus; 36, 18, 5 multum a. qui. . . ingerebant; 36, 12, 5 trepidantibus. Compare with these 2, 29, 5 quaestionem postulantibus iis qui pulsati fuerant. Similar to these is 3, 44, 9 auctoribus, qui aderant, ut sequeretur, ad tribunal Appi perventum est. The same form of expression with an adjective is found 21, 50, 7 nondum gnaris eius quae Messanae erant; and, if we interpret as an ablative absolute, with another pronominal form of expression, 10, 12, 5 nox incertis, qua data victoria esset, intervenit.

In a few passages the subject of the perf. part. in the abl. abs. is to be understood from the context, or from a construction the equivalent of a relative clause: 1, 31, 2 missis ad id visendum; 33, 11, 1; 39, 35, 4; 2, 34, 3 dimissis passim ad frumendum; 10, 29, 18 dimissis ad quaerendum corpus. In 29, 5, 8 Mago milites Gallos dimissis clam per agros eorum mercede conducere, if correct, a general subject must be supplied. In other instances it can be readily supplied from the context: 6, 29, 6 ad ea circumlatum bellum . . . captis; 7, 27, 8 quattuor milia deditorum habita; eos vinctos . . . venditis deinde magnam pecuniam in aerarium redegit; 10, 3, 5 Marsos fundit. compulsis deinde in munitas urbes . . . cepit; 22, 46, 8 sol, seu de industria ita locatis, seu quod forte ita steteret . . . obliquus erat; 28, 12, 9 nec ab

domo quicquam mittebatur de Hispania retinenda sollicitis, tamquam omnia prospera in Italia essent; 29, 22, 2 quo die venerunt hospitio comiter acceptis, postero die . . . ostendit; 42, 36, 7 ita dimissis P. Licinio consuli mandatum, intra decimum diem iuberet eos Italia decedere. Similar to these are a few instances of the use of *iussis*: 2, 7, 8 ibi audire iussis consul laudare fortunam collegae; 38, 10, 2 iussis proficisci Romam; 42, 53, 1 tantum iussis ad iter parare.

There are numerous examples in which the present participle stands alone, and in many instances it may be taken as a dative or an ablative according to the interpretative angle at which it is viewed: 1, 23, 10 quaerentibus utrimque ratio initur; 2, 23, 5 sciscitantibus unde ille habitus, unde deformitas . . . ait; 2, 49, 7 praetereuntibus Capitolium; 4, 60, 1; 8, 21, 1 prout cuiusque ingenium erat atrocius mitiusve suadentibus; 22, 1, 10 metentibus . . . spicas cecidisse; 25, 9, 13; 25, 41, 2; 27, 20, 4; 30, 3, 7; 31, 46, 13; 34, 33, 11; 36, 14, 12; 38, 15, 2; 38, 26, 7; 42, 16, 7. Here also may be classed experientibus 32, 2, 2; and metientibus . . . explesse 23, 12, 1 given as datives by Draeger 2, 790.

In some of these examples the subject of the participle is to be supplied from the statement outside of the clause in which it stands, as in 38, 26, 7 velut destinatum petentibus (sc. hostibus), vulnera accipiebant; 42, 16, 7 secreta eius curatio fuit, admittentibus (sc. amicis) neminem. Somewhat resembling these are the instances in which the real subject of the ablative absolute is not in the main, but in a subordinate statement, e. g. 7, 14, 9 instructo vani terroris apparatu . . . credere duces Gallorum; 8, 20, 7 senatus . . . consulem Plautium, dirutis Priverni muris praesidioque valido imposito, ad triumphum accersit; 39, 54, 13 Galli redditus omnibus, quae . . . habebant, Italia excesserunt (sc. legati); 45, 26, 10 simili pertinacia Cephalonis principis clausum Tecmonem ipso interfecto . . . recepit. In other passages the abl. abs. is used with an impersonal verb, e. g. 5, 25, 7 adhibito Camillo visum; 5, 31, 1 delenita plebe certatum est; 5, 54, 7 capite humano invento responsum est.

SUBJECT OF MAIN STATEMENT INCLUDED.

The arrangement of the subject of the main clause within the abl. abs. is comparatively infrequent: 1, 7, 11 dextra Hercules data; (1, 29, 4 quibus quisque poterat elatis); 1, 39, 2 sedato eam tumultu moveri vetuisse puerum; 4, 44, 10; 9, 14, 2 ea legatione

Papirius audita; 21, 31, 9 sedatis Hannibal certaminibus; 21, 45 9; 21, 48, 5; 22, 17, 7; 24, 25, 3 clausis Adranodorus Insulae portis; 29, 2, 2; 32, 24, 4 relictis suis quisque stationibus; 33, 3, 4 emeritis quidam stipendiis; 33, 9, 11 omissis plerique armis; 36, 7, 7 hoc ego adiuncto; 45, 10, 2. The present participle is used 38, 47, 7 accusantibus meis ipse legatis. See Draeger 2, p. 792; Reisig-Haase 3, p. 771, N. 591.

Similar to these are the passages in which the subject of the main verb is arranged between two ablatives absolute, though it may not stand in the same relation to them both: 1, 52, 1 revocatis deinde ad concilium Latinis Tarquinius conlaudatisque qui, though this may be a dative depending on ita verba fecit 1, 58, 1 paucis interiectis diebus Sex. Tarquinius inscio Collatino; 4, 49, 7; 7, 7, 8; 7, 32, 1; 7, 37, 1; 7, 41, 3; 8, 19, 13; 8, 39, 3 deleto prope equitatu hostium M. Fabius circumductis paulum alis; 32, 24, 6; 33, 20, 10; 42, 55, 5. The ablative absolute itself may be placed between two clauses to which it stands in the same relation, e. g. 8, 30, 7 auctores habeo bis cum hoste signa conlata dictatore absente, bis rem egregie gestam.

SEPARATION OF PARTS.

As shown by Bombe, *De Abl. Abs. ap. antiquissimos Rom. scriptores usu*, p. 31 seqq., in the earliest writers the parts of the abl. abs. are rarely separated. In Lucretius (Bombe p. 35; Holtze p. 13) separation is not uncommon, though but rarely more than one word intervenes as if the original solidarity of the abl. abs. were kept in view. It is along this line of the separation of the parts that there came a greater freedom in the use of the construction.

Nepos.—In Nepos about 18% of the example have the parts separated, in nearly all instances by a single word—noun, adverb, prepositional phrase—nominal modifiers rarely occurring, e. g. Han. 10, 1 sic conservatis suis rebus omnibus; Att. 22, 4 comitantibus omnibus bonis. When there is separation by two words, counting as one prepositional phrases, one of them is an adjective: Milt. 2, 4 Chersoneso tali modo constituta; Lys. 2, 1 potestate in omnibus urbibus constituta; Ham. 3, 1 rebus his ex sententia peractis; an adverb: Alc. 4, 7 praesidio ibi perpetuo posito; Han. 6, 2 exhaustis iam patriae facultatibus; or two accusatives: Pelop. 3, 3 vulgo ad arma libertatemque vocato. Separation by three

words is uncommon: Iph. 3, 3 placatis in se suorum civium animis; Chabrias 1, 2 fugatis iam ab eo conducticiis catervis. The subject is included in Paus. 5, 1 his rebus ephori cognitis; Dion. 2, 5 hoc aeger sumpto sopitus, diem obiit supremum; Han. 7, 4 hoc responso Carthaginienses cognito Hannibalem et Magonem revocarunt. Cf. Datam. 5, 5 talibus ille litteris cognitis.

Sallust.—In the Catiline the parts of the ablative absolute are separated in about 10% of the examples, and there appears a form not in Nepos, separation by a clause, 43, 1 paratis, ut videbatur, magnis copiis, while others are separated by genitive or adverb. In the Jugurtha 20% have intervening words. Relative clauses are relatively common in this position: 72, 1 Bomilcare aliisque multis, quos socios insidiarum cognoverat, interfectis; 73, 3 et Romae plebes litteris, quae de Metello ac Mario missae erant, cognitis; 84, 5 omnibus, quae postulaverat, decretis; 104, 1 confecto quod intenderat negotio. Cf. Livy 23, 31, 8 confecto quod mandatum est negotio.

In a dozen passages more than one word intervenes: 18, 3 multis sibi quisque imperium petentibus; 51, 3 omnibus labore et aestu languidis. In other instances the words are so closely connected that we should not expect them to be separated: 19, 1 aliis novarum rerum avidis; 21, 2 and 40, 4 etiam tum; 29, 2 plerisque ex factione eius corruptis; 60, 6 illis studio suorum adstrictis; 63, 4 plerisque faciem eius ignorantibus; 91, 2 castris levi munimento positis; 36, 4 Albinus Aulo fratre in castris propraetore relicto Romam decessit; 102, 13 missis antea Romam legatis. In addition to 18, 3, quoted above, the subject is included 105, 1 quis rebus Bocchus cognitis, though here the order of words is not the same in all editions.

In the orations and epistles of the Histories of Sallust, separation is noticeable only in the Ep. Mithridatis. The spurious works present nothing of importance in this respect, excepting In Sall. 5, 14 quo hic nondum mortuo; and Ep. Caes. 3, 4 tamquam urbe capta, which has nothing similar in Sall. excepting Jug. 100, 3 quasi nullo imposito.

Caesar.—In the B. G. the parts of the abl. abs. are separated in about one-fourth of the instances, and in but a small number of these do more than two words intervene. Sometimes it is a single adverb, e. g. 3, 3, 1 concilio celeriter advocato; 5, 11, 7 castris egregie munitis; 7, 15, 6 dissuadente primo Vercingetorige, post concedente. Adjectives less frequently intervene: 7, 46, 3 spatio

vacuo relicto; 7, 77, 1 *consumpto omni frumento*. The separation is most commonly by a single genitive: 1, 42, 1 *cognito Caesaris adventu*; 5, 6, 4 *omni spe impetrandi adempta*; 7, 75, 1 *concilio principum indicto*; or by a prepositional phrase: 3, 23, 8 *hac re ad consilium delata*; 5, 1, 9 *iis ad diem adductis*; 6, 31, 2 *dimissis per agros nuntiis*; or by a phrase and dependent genitive: 3, 22, 4 *clamore ab ea parte munitionis sublato*; 6, 44, 1 *concilio in eum locum Galliae indicto*; 7, 80, 1 *omni exercitu ad utramque partem munitionum disposito*. Occasionally another required case is used instead of the genitive: 6, 3, 2 *praeda militibus concessa*; 6, 44, 3 *frumento exercitui proviso*; 7, 68, 2; 7, 67, 1 *omnibus iure iurando adactis*; 7, 81, 5 *prospectu tenebris adempto*; 3, 29, 2 *magno spatio paucis diebus confecto*. In a few instances a compact group of three words intervene: 4, 4, 5 *itinere una nocte equitatu confecto*; 1, 25, 3 *scutis uno ictu pilorum transfixis*; 5, 51, 1 *nostris vero etiam de vallo deductis*; 7, 6, 1 *his rebus in Italiam Caesari nuntiatis*; 4, 19, 4; 4, 32, 1 *legione ex consuetudine una frumentatum missa*; 7, 41, 1 *tribus horis [noctis] exercitui ad quietem datis*. Exclusive of those containing an explanatory clause, in but few instances are the parts more widely separated than in the examples just quoted: 7, 73, 2 *truncis arborum admodum firmis ramis abscisis*; 7, 37, 6 *adulescentibus et oratione magistratus et praemio deductis*; 5, 8, 1 *Labiено in continente cum tribus legionibus et equitum milibus duobus relicto*.

Separation by clauses alone, or in connection with other words, is fairly common: 1, 37, 5 *re frumentaria, quam celerrime potuit, comparata*; 3, 15, 1 *deiectis, ut diximus, antennis*; 2, 33, 2 *inito, ut intellectum est, consilio*; 6, 3, 4 *concilio Galliae primo vere, uti instituerat, indicto*. Relative clauses occur more frequently: 2, 7, 3 *aedificiis, quos adire poterant, incensis*; 2, 8, 5 *duabus legionibus, quas proxime conscripserat, in castris relictis*; 2, 29, 4; 6, 30, 2 *omni militari instrumento, quod circum habebat, erepto*; 7, 57, 1; 2, 32, 4; 5, 3, 4 *iis qui per aetatem in armis esse non poterant, in silvam Arduennam abditis*.

The insertion of the subject of the principal clause between the parts of the ablative absolute is not of frequent occurrence: 1, 44, 10 *debere se suspicari simulata Caesarem amicitia*; 2, 11, 2; 5, 49, 4; 6, 9, 8; 6, 17, 5; 7, 1, 4 *indictis inter se principes Galliae conciliis*.

In some instances two participles are used with one subject, and

the absolute construction is extended to a considerable length by placing the second participle at some distance from the first: 4, 17, 7 quibus disclusis atque in contrariam partem revinctis; 5, 21, 1 Trinobantibus defensis atque omni militum iniuria prohibitis. More common is the separation from the absolute noun of a modifying adjective: 3, 6, 3 sic omnibus hostium copiis fuis; 5, 4, 1 omnibus ad Britannicum bellum rebus comparatis; 5, 30, 1 hac in utramque partem disputatione habita; 6, 3, 2 magno pecoris atque hominum numero capto; 6, 9, 5 firmo in Treveris ad pontem praesidio relicto; 6, 40, 6; 7, 36, 1; 7, 50, 4; 7, 56, 4; 7, 66, 4 maioribus enim coactis copiis.

In the *Bellum Civile* about one-third of the instances are divided, adverbs intervening a little more frequently than in the B. G., but in other respects the two works are the same. Book VIII of the B. G., and the B. Al. have an especially large number of adverbs intervening, and in the latter work about 40% of the examples are divided. The B. Af. does not separate the parts quite so freely, while the B. H. varies little from the earlier usage of an undivided ablative absolute.

Livy.—Of 6457 ablatives absolute noticed in *Livy* one-third have the parts separated. This is especially frequent at the beginning of clauses when continuative particles and adverbs are commonly included. Some of these will be given with a single citation for each: *enim* 32, 31, 3; *igitur* 23, 26, 7; *ita* 8, 20, 10; *itaque* 8, 30, 11. *deinde* 6, 8, 1; *iam* 3, 40, 8; *inde* 7, 7, 2; *nondum* 1, 17, 3; *prius* 22, 6, 4; *postremo* 22, 49, 2; *saepe* 3, 12, 4; *simul* 10, 22, 3; *statim* 28, 7, 9; *tandem* 2, 57, 2. *alibi* 5, 1, 1; *ibi* 10, 36, 18; *nusquam* 3, 64, 9; *passim* 21, 57, 5; *procul* 40, 8, 5; *haud p.* 23, 43, 6; *undique* 2, 11, 1; *utrimque* 7, 26, 7. *etiam* 25, 31, 10; *quidem* 28, 5, 15; *quoque* 24, 30, 1. *frustra* 3, 26, 1; *haudquam* 8, 12, 11; *nequiquam* 7, 12, 6. *feliciter* 10, 37, 8; *foede* 22, 3, 1; *mature* 22, 32, 1; *raptim* 9, 38, 2; *rite* 22, 10, 8; *salubriter* 3, 59, 1; *temere* 10, 40, 13.

The genitive is the case most frequently included within the abl. abs., though there is no hesitation in so placing other forms: 1, 37, 5 captivis Romam missis; 10, 25, 11 praepositoque castris L. Scipione; 7, 5, 5 omnibus abire iussis; 6, 5, 1 civitate aedificando occupata. When there are more words than one placed between the parts they may be any of the combinations of modifiers that can be grouped around the subject and the participle, e. g. 23, 30, 3 absumptis enim frugum alimentis; 3, 3, 1

relicto itaque castris praesidio; 5, 40, 10 salvo etiam tum discrimine; 3, 48, 6 multitudine etiam prosequentium tuente; 36, 3, 13 omnibus iam satis comparatis; 7, 24, 3 humero matari prope trajecto; 5, 7, 5 consilio prius inter se habito; 5, 8, 2 proditis repente portarum custodibus; 5, 49, 8 tribunis rem intentius agentibus; 9, 45, 2 oratione ultro citro habita; 5, 13, 1 neglectis die festo custodiis urbis; 2, 15, 7 spe omni reditus incisa; 1, 19, 4 positis externorum periculorum curis; 1, 33, 4 bello Latino Medulliam compulso; 1, 18, 8 dextra in caput Numae imposita; 5, 47, 7 vocatis classico ad concilium militibus; 6, 4, 3 pretio pro auro matronis persoluto; 3, 4, 5 principibus coloniae Romam excitis; 5, 25, 8 coetibus ad eam rem consultandam habitis; 8, 9, 5 manu subter togam ad mentum exserta; 1, 19, 3 pace terra marique parta; 32, 26, 10 quibus domi custodiri iussis.

Other modifiers are freely introduced, and in this way the participle is frequently far removed from its noun, just as though it were a finite form of the verb with its subject, e. g. 1, 38, 2 paucis verbis carminis concipiendique iuris iurandi mutatis; 7, 11, 9 consulibus in senatu et apud populum magnifice conlaudatis; 29, 15, 1 dempto iam tandem deum benignitate metu; 10, 1, 3 quaestione ab consulibus ex senatus consulto habita; 26, 25, 11 senioribus super sexaginta annos in propinquam Epirum missis; 25, 39, 9 concursu ex totis castris ad primum clamorem et tumultum facto. Separation by clauses is worthy of especial notice: 29, 32, 7 quibusdam, ut occurrerent, per obliqua tendentibus; 22, 40, 8 frumento, postquam ager parum tutus erat, in urbes munitas convecto; 29, 24, 2, legatis propere, priusquam res vulgaretur, remissis; 40, 33, 4 superatis, ubi primum remiserunt imbres, amnibus; 42, 66, 7 iumentis, cum stimularentur, in turba saevientibus; 4, 48, 10 probantibus cunctis et ante omnes Q. Servilio Prisco, quod non degenerasset ab stirpe Claudia, conlaudante. When the relative clause is placed between the parts it seems to make no difference whether the antecedent precedes or follows: 10, 43, 6 loco, quem magis timuerant, victo; 32, 24, 6 relicto, quem conferti tuebantur, loco; 34, 43, 9 dimissis, quos senatus censuisset, exercitibus; 31, 26, 4; 36, 8, 5 ossibus, quae passim strata erant, coacervatis; 3, 52, 3 nullo, qui per aetatem ire posset, retractante; 21, 28, 9 resolutis, quibus leviter adnexa erat, vinculis. At times there is inserted a parenthetical statement, e. g. 1, 47, 10; 2, 6, 1, his, sicut acta erant, nuntiatis; 8, 9, 2; 10, 1, 5 ore—nam pervius erat—invento; 31, 32, 1 pecunia, ut fama est, ab rege accepta; 37, 14, 5 sacrificio, ut adsolet, rite facto.

For convenience some of the passages in which the parts are most widely separated may be arranged under subheads according to the part of the abl. abs. which the included words modify.

Subject and Participle.—1, 7, 14 donec tradito servis publicis sollemni familiae ministerio; 4, 32, 4 Larte Tolumnio rege Veientium in conspectu duorum exercituum occiso; 22, 20, 7 ibi urbe, quae caput insulae est, biduum nequiquam summo labore oppugnata; 28, 5, 15 segetibus tamen, quae iam prope maturitatem erant, maxime in sinu Aenianum evastatis; 30, 10, 4 rostratis, quae praesidio aliis esse poterant, in postremam aciem receptis; 31, 16, 2 Philocle quodam ex praefectis suis cum duobus milibus peditum, equitibus ducentis ad populandos Atheniensium agros misso.

Subject.—1, 59, 11 his atrocioribusque, credo, aliis, quae praesens rerum indignitas haudquaquam relatu scriptoribus facilia subicit, memoratis; 7, 26, 14 aqua etiam praeter cetera necessaria usui deficiente; 8, 12, 6 ibi Publilio, cuius ductu auspicioque res gestae erant, in deditionem accipiente; 31, 2, 8; 23, 48, 2 retento Nolae necessario ad tuendam urbem praesidio; 6, 35, 6 nullo remedio alio praeter expertam multis iam ante certaminibus intercessionem invento; 39, 17, 4 litteris hospitum de senatus consulto et contione et edicto consulum acceptis; 43, 19, 2 ibi Romanis—quattuor milia autem hominum erant—praeter principes in custodiam civitatum divis. However, the most noticeable modifiers of the subject are the relative clauses, and the instances of the widest separation are due to these as in the first two examples quoted.

Participle.—4, 50, 6 tribunis militum de morte collegae per senatum quaestiones decernentibus; 4, 18, 3 iam militibus castra urbemque se oppugnatuuros frementibus; 22, 3, 8 omnibus in consilio salutaria magis quam speciosa suadentibus; 25, 17, 5 ipso Hannibale omni rerum verborumque honore exequias celebrante; 4, 12, 6 regno prope per largitionis dulcedinem in cervices accepto; 23, 46, 9; 4, 13, 2 frumento namque ex Etruria privata pecunia per hospitum clientiumque ministeria coempto; 26, 2, 1 imperio non populi iussu, non ex auctoritate patrum dato; 27, 5, 7 rogatione ab tribuno plebis ex auctoritate patrum ad plebem lata; 30, 8, 2 praesidiis ad speciem modo obsidionis terra marique relictis; 31, 26, 2 parte militum ad praedandum passim per agros dimissa; 37, 35, 2 legationibus ultro citroque nequiquam de pace missis; 37, 26, 5 Polyxenida cum classe ad

temptandum omni modo certaminis fortunam misso; 38, 16, 6 Macedonibus per speciem legationis ab Antipatro ad speculandum missis; 38, 37, 11 L. Manlio fratre cum quattuor milibus militum Oroanda ad reliquum pecuniae ex eo, quod pepigerant, exigendum misso; 27, 5, 1 M. Valerio Messalla praefecto classis cum parte navium in Africam praedatum simul speculatumque, quae populus Carthaginiensis ageret pararetque, misso.

Subordinate Word.—An explanation is sometimes added of some word that is included: 21, 12, 1 Maharbale Himilconis filio—eum praefecerat Hannibal—ita impigre rem agente; 21, 32, 11 die deinde simulando aliud, quam quod parabatur, consumpto; 27, 32, 4 contracto iam inter Aetolos et Tralles—Illyriorum id est genus—certamine; 25, 9, 1 decem milibus peditum atque equitum, quos in expeditionem velocitate corporum ac levitate armorum aptissimos esse ratos est, electis; 27, 10, 11 cetera expedientibus, quae ad bellum opus erant, consulibus aurum . . . promi placuit; 31, 15, 8 omnibus praeter Andrum Parumque et Cythnum, quae praesidiis Macedonum tenebantur, in societatem acceptis; 37, 37, 2 castrisque in campo, qui est subiectus montibus, positis; 42, 51, 2; 44, 30, 10; 37, 51, 7 dilectibus intra paucos dies—neque enim multi milites legendi erant—perfectis; 38, 31, 5 triginta hominibus ex factione, cum qua consiliorum aliqua societas Philopoemeni atque exulibus erat, interfectis; 38, 39, 6; 40, 28, 3 clamore pariter omnium qui in castris erant, calorum quoque et lixarum, sublato.

As a good example of expansion of all parts will be given 6, 22 1 quattuor collegis, Ser. Cornelio Maluginensi tertium Q. Servilio C. Sulpicio L. Aemilio quartum, ad praesidium urbis, et si qui ex Etruria novi motus nuntiarentur—omnia enim inde suspecta erant—relictis.

Here also may be given a few examples of extended ablatives absolute in which the absolute group is of considerable length: 4, 48, 10; 6, 35, 10 eaque solitudo magistratum et plebe reficiente duos tribunos et iis comitia tribunorum militum tollentibus per quinquennium urbem habuit; cf. 26, 22, 12 plenis iam honorum, Q. Fabio et M. Marcello, et, si utique novum aliquem adversus Poenos consulem creari vellent, M. Valerio Laevino, in which *plenis* is abl. agreeing with the preceding *de tribus . . . duobus*.

V.—EARLY PARALLELISMS IN ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *περὶ Θουκυδίδου* 5 and 23, gives a survey of early Greek historiography, in which he speaks of the logographers as (5) *ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν φυλάττοντες σκοπόν, ὅσαι διεσφύζοντο παρὰ τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις μῆμαι κατὰ ἔθνη τε καὶ κατὰ πόλεις, εἴτ' ἐν ἱεροῖς εἴτ' ἐν βεβήλοις ἀποκείμεναι γραφαί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀπάντων γνώσιν ἐξενεγκεῖν, οἷας παρέλαβον, μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτ' ἀφαιρούντες* . . . *λέξιν* . . . *ἐπιτηδεύσαντες* . . . *τὴν σαφὴ καὶ κοινὴν καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ σύντομον καὶ τοῖς πράγμασι προσφυῇ καὶ μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσιν τεχνικὴν.* ὁ δ' Ἀλικαρνασσεὺς Ἡρόδοτος, he continues, . . . *τὴν τε πραγματικὴν προαίρεσιν ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον ἐξήνεγκε καὶ λαμπρότερον* . . . *καὶ τῇ λέξει προσαπέδωκε τὰς παραλειφθείσας ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ συγγραφέων ἀρετάς.* (23) *οὗτος δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν καὶ κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν, μακρῷ δὴ τινι τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο.*

This passage exhibits a number of striking similarities, both in matter and phraseology, to the conversation ascribed by Cicero, *De Oratore* II 51-54, to Antonius and Catulus: "Age vero," inquit Antonius, 'qualis oratoris et quanti hominis in dicendo putas esse historiam scribere?' 'Si ut Graeci scripserunt, summi,' inquit Catulus; 'si ut nostri, nihil opus est oratore; satis est non esse mendacem.' 'Atqui, ne nostros contemnas,' inquit Antonius, 'Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso. Erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, cuius rei memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus efferebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi: ii qui etiam nunc annales maximi nominantur. Hanc similitudinem (οἷας παρέλαβον) scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis (μηδεμίαν σκευωρίαν ἐπιφαίνουσιν τεχνικὴν) monumenta (μῆμαι) solum (μήτε προστιθέντες αὐταῖς τι μήτ' ἀφαιρούντες) temporum hominum locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt. Itaque qualis apud Graecos Pherecydes Hellanicus Acusilas fuit aliiue permulti, talis noster Cato et Pictor

et Piso, qui neque tenent quibus rebus ornetur oratio—modo enim huc ista sunt importata—et, dum intellegatur quid dicant (σαφή), unam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitatem (σύντομον). Paulum se erexit (ἐπὶ τὸ μείζον ἐξήνεγκε) et addidit (προσαπίδωκε) maiorem historiae sonum vocis vir optimus Crassi familiaris Antipater. Ceteri non exornatores rerum sed tantummodo narratores fuerunt.' 'Est,' inquit Catulus, 'ut dicis. Sed iste ipse Caelius neque distinxit historiam varietate¹ colorum (κατὰ τὴν τῶν σχηματισμῶν ποικιλίαν) neque verborum collocatione (κατὰ τὴν ἐκλογὴν τῶν ὀνομάτων) et tractu orationis (κατὰ τὴν σύνθεσιν) leni et aequabili perpolivit illud opus, sed ut homo neque doctus neque maxime aptus ad dicendum, sicut potuit dolavit; vicit tamen, ut dicis, superiores (τοὺς ἄλλους ὑπερεβάλετο).'"

In the above conversation, Cicero seems partly to accept, partly to criticise a comparison of the earliest Latin historians to the Greek logographers, and of Caelius Antipater, the first Roman *exornator rerum*, to Herodotus, *qui princeps genus hoc ornavit* (De Or. II 55). Antonius is appropriately made an apologist for the Roman side, while Catulus denies that Caelius has paralleled the achievements of Herodotus in the two divisions of λέξις and the use of imagery (περὶ θουκ. 22).

The resemblances in phraseology indicate that the original of the sketch in Dionysius was used as a model by some Roman literary critic prior to the time of composition of the De Oratore. It seems altogether likely that the body of criticism extant in Cicero's time, which made Ennius a Homer, Afranius a Menander, and Plautus an Epicharmus, and manufactured an analogue for the old Attic comedy, also carried parallelism with Greek literature into the field of historical composition. Cicero, admitting the undeveloped state of Roman historiography, protests against the exaggerated rank which had been given to Caelius. The Latin authority used by Cicero may also have contained a characterization of Greek historians, which was a model for the estimate of them given by Antonius directly following the passage quoted above.

Cicero has, in De Legibus I 5-7, a personal motive for disparaging the Roman historians, for his plan, which Atticus here urges him to fulfil, is to write himself a history which shall be

¹ If the grouping of these passages from Dionysius and Cicero be right, it affords evidence for the correctness of Jacobs' emendation of *colorum* (54) in place of the MS reading *locorum*.

worthy of comparison with the productions of the Greeks. In surveying the field of historical composition, he again uses the two-fold classification employed in the *De Oratore*, making Atticus, in language which recalls the earlier criticism, say of Caelius, who begins the new epoch: "Antipater paulo inflavit vehementius habuitque vires agrestis ille quidem atque horridas, sine nitore ac palaestra, sed tamen admonere reliquos potuit ut adcuratius scriberent." The predecessors of Caelius are grouped as *exiles scriptores*, while Sisenna¹ is recognized as the best Roman historian up to that time, and compared to Clitarchus, which was perhaps another current literary parallelism.

In the *Brutus*, 63 and 66, Cicero makes use of a comparison, for which the Atticists² of his time seem to be responsible, of Cato to Lysias, Philistus, and Thucydides. Later in the work (293, 294), this estimate is criticised and corrected by Atticus, who calls it an example of Socratic irony. It seems probable that Cicero is here dealing with another current literary parallelism, which he criticises through a person of the dialogue, as in the *De Oratore* and *De Legibus*.

Cicero, in his own opinion and in that of his friends, was the man to write an appropriate history of Rome. This judgment is stated by Nepos³ in *libro de historicis Latinis*, fr. 7: "Non ignorare debes unum hoc genus Latinarum litterarum adhuc non modo non respondere Graeciae, sed omnino rude atque incohatum morte Ciceronis relictum. ille enim fuit unus qui potuerit et etiam debuerit historiam digna voce pronuntiare, quippe qui oratoriam eloquentiam rudem a maioribus acceptam perpoliverit, philosophiam ante eum incomptam Latinam sua conformavit oratione. ex quo dubito interitu eius utrum res publica an historia magis doleat."

From the preceding discussion, the conclusion seems to follow that there existed in Cicero's time a body of early literary criticism which in historiography compared Roman writers to individual Greek writers—Caelius to Herodotus and the predecessors of Caelius to the Greek logographers, Cato to Thucydides, and Sisenna to Clitarchus. This would give the Romans representatives in the three departments of σύνθεσις—αὐστηρά, ἀνθηρά, and

¹ Cf. *Brutus*, 228.

² Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa* I 258-259.

³ Cf. Atticus in *De Legibus* I 5-7.

κοινῇ. The early critics seem to have considered Latin literature in all its branches as developed and complete. Cicero and his friends, while admitting that in historiography these comparisons are to some extent justifiable, criticise and limit them, and call attention to the rudimentary condition of Roman literature in this department.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

JOHN D. WOLCOTT.

NOTES.

TENNYSONIANA.

The familiar line in Tennyson 'Ode on the death of the Duke of Wellington,'

"O good gray head which all men knew,"

may have been suggested by Claudian, *De Bello Gothico*, 459-60. This is the vivid passage which describes the return of Claudian's hero to Rome after the battle of Pollentia, just when the Romans were expecting the arrival of the dreaded Alaric. It was quoted by Disraeli, Nov. 15, 1852, in his speech in moving a resolution thanking the Queen for having ordered a public funeral for the Duke of Wellington: "Who, indeed, can ever forget that venerable and classic head, ripe with time and radiant as it were with glory?"

'Stilichonis apex et cognita fulsit
Canities'"

('Hansard', Third Series, vol. cxxiii, col. 153). Disraeli's oration achieved an immediate notoriety because of certain striking resemblances to an article published twenty-three years earlier by the French historian Thiers. These were gleefully set forth next morning in the London 'Globe.' It is probable that Tennyson read the speech which was so much discussed, and so bitterly criticized, and, whether consciously or not, made use of the Latin quotation for the ode on which he was then engaged. Indeed, his indebtedness is apparently not confined to the Latin phrase: Disraeli also states that Wellington "never lost a single gun." Perhaps I should add that Disraeli's biographer seems to include the quotation from Claudian among the good things which were borrowed from the French article (T. E. Kebbel, 'Life of Lord Beaconsfield,' p. 88). But he is mistaken. The French article was a review of the 'Mémoires' of Marshal St. Cyr, published in the *Revue Française* for November, 1829. It was for some time falsely ascribed to Armand Carrel, and was even printed in Littré

and Paulin's edition of Carrel's works (Paris, 1859, vol. v, pp. 132-74). It seems to contain no mention either of Claudian or of any one's "*cognita canities*."

Tennyson's poem 'The Death of Oenone' was dedicated to Professor Jowett as:

"a Grecian tale re-told,
Which, cast in later Grecian mould,
Quintus Calaber
Somewhat lazily handled of old."

The point of the phrase "somewhat lazily handled" is not very obvious; the judgment of Sainte-Beuve seems fairer: "*L'Épisode d'Oenone s'élève et se détache par une beauté de premier ordre; cette peinture vaudrait seule à l'auteur un rang incontestable parmi les vrais poètes.*" Moreover, the Greek poem has supplied, or suggested, almost all the details of the English story—a fact which is worth remembering in view of Tennyson's own opinion that his new 'Oenone' was "even more strictly classical in form and language than the old" (*Memoir*, ii, 386). The author of the *Memoir* is sadly wrong when he calls 'The Death of Oenone' one of 'those classical subjects from mythology and legend, which had been before but imperfectly treated, or of which the stories were slight' (ii. 13). Mr. Stopford Brooke condemns as unclassical two features of the poem which come directly from the Greek (Tennyson: *His Art and Relation to Modern Life*, p. 142). He thinks that Tennyson has changed the ancient story—changed it for the worse: "It is too improbable that Paris should walk up Ida to call for Oenone, considering where and how he was wounded; or stagger down the hill from her. If the art of the piece were made better by this change in the tale, this criticism would be naught; but it is not made better, and the improbability is impossibility." And he protests against calling the union between Paris and the nymph Oenone a marriage; it was not a marriage, he insists, nor anything that resembled it. "Nor do I understand the husband and wife and widow business, unless it be that Tennyson desired to express over again his devotion to the eternity and sanctity of the marriage relation. This is wholly out of place in the story," etc. But in both of these matters, Tennyson is simply following his Greek model: see Quintus, X. 264, 332-3, 265, 414, 286, 468, etc. Even so a good scholar as Professor Arthur Palmer forgot that the English poem is merely

"a Grecian tale re-told," and wrote in his commentary on Ovid, Her. v. 156, that Tennyson "defrauds Evadne of her unique place in mythology by making Oenone leap on to the burning pyre of Paris," compare Quintus, X. 466 ff.:

ἀλλὰ καλυψαμένη περὶ φάρεϊ καλὰ πρόσωπα
αἶψα πυρρῇ ἐνέπαλτο· γόνυ δ' ἄρα πουλὺν ὄρινε·
καίετο δ' ἀμφὶ πόσει.

WILFRED P. MUSTARD.

ΚΑΙΤΟΙ WITH THE PARTICIPLE.

Two American scholars, Morgan in his *Eight Orations of Lysias*, Boston, 1897, and Smyth in his *Greek Melic Poets*, London, 1900, have recently accepted as a rarity the construction of *καίτοι* with the participle, the doctrine going back to Goodwin, *Moods and Tenses* § 861, cf. also Kuehner, 644 and Krueger 56. 13. 2. Morgan at *Lysias XXXI* 34 attempts, in his appendix, the defense of the construction on the ground of its "naturalness." Its origin of course is the analogical influence of *καίπερ* with the participle—a force that resulted conversely in the use of *καίπερ* with the finite verb—but the evidence brought for the operation of this force in classic times proves on examination insufficient.

The passages usually cited are: Simonides, ap. Plato, *Prot.* 339 C; Aristophanes, *Eccl.* 159; *Lysias*, *XXXI* 34; Plato, *Rep.* VI 511 D; *Axioch.* 364 B. To these Morgan adds Xenophon, *Mem.* I 7. 2. Of these six passages, one is in a spurious dialogue of Plato's. Two more in reality are not examples of the construction: In the passage from Xenophon, *καίτοι πολλὰ μὲν δαπανῶν, μηδὲν δ' ὠφελούμενος, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις κακοδοξῶν πῶς οὐκ ἐπιπόνως τε καὶ ἀλυσιτελῶς καὶ καταγελάστως βιώσεται, καίτοι* introduces the question beginning with *πῶς* and the participles are conditional as the negative shows, cf. Antiphon, VI 32 for the order of the words. In the example from Simonides we have simply a case of the omission of the copula, cf. Gildersleeve, *SCG.* § 83, for the general range of this usage, and note that such omissions are very frequent in this poem. Examples of the omission of the copula when the predicate is a participle are, to be sure, not very plentiful. From Homer are cited *Ω* 42 which is rather an anacoluthon, and *λ* 606 ff. The participle in the latter example

however *λοικῶς* is quite thoroughly adjectivized and examples with it recur: Theognis, 279; Timocreon, 2. 3; Pindar, Pyth. I 34 (Christ); Frag. 81. Other examples from lyric poets are: Solon, 13. 52 (unless a distich has fallen out); Theognis, 227 (the version in Solon 13. 71, however contains a copula *κεῖται*); Anacreon, 21, 9-11 (better than to supply *ἦ* from preceding stanza); Alkaios, 15. 5; and especially Archilochus, 2. 1, 'Εν δορὶ μὲν μοι μάλα μεμαγμένη which are a sufficient warrant for the construction proposed.

Of the three passages that remain, Blaydes has emended the one from Aristophanes: *καίτοι τά γ' ἄλλ' εἶπας σὺ δεξιώτατα*. The emendation has been adopted by von Velsen and is undoubtedly to be preferred to the *εἰποῦσα* of the Manuscripts. In the passage from Lysias 'Ικανά μοι νομίζω εἰρῆσθαι, *καίτοι πολλά γε παραλείπω* Frohberger simply changes *καίτοι* to *καίπερ*. This however is impossible, as it is contrary to the usage, not only of Lysias, but of all the early orators. Cf. my dissertation, *The Participle in Hesiod*, Reprint from *The Catholic University Bulletin*, III p. 431 n.¹ The correction can also be accomplished with less violence to the tradition by reading *παραλείπω*. Itacism would yield *παραλίπω* which would then be corrected (!) to *παραλιπών* in accordance with the tendency of the scribes to introduce this familiar construction, cf. Aristophanes, *Frogs*, 43 where, though the original text was clear, *καίτοι δάκνω[ν] γ' ἐμᾶντόν* has got into two manuscripts. Demosthenes XVIII 110 illustrates the use of the present and clinches the matter: *ικανῶς ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων δεδηλώσθαι μοι νομίζω. καίτοι τὰ μέγιστα γε παραλείπω κτλ.* The passage in the Republic does not seem to be questioned by any of the editors, but in the light of the above facts it cannot be allowed to stand. The words *καίτοι νοητῶν ὄντων μετὰ ἀρχῆς* could easily be dispensed with and it may be that the false syntax points to their being a gloss; if not, it is necessary to change *καίτοι* to *καίπερ*.

For the sake of completeness it may be mentioned that in Herodotos VIII 53, Abicht and Stein read *καίτοι περ* with the α-family, Holder, van Herwerden and Kallenberg *καίπερ* with the β-family. This course seems to be preferable as affording the simplest explanation of the variant: *καίτοι* was first written, because familiar to the scribe, and then corrected, the correction however was taken for an addition and both were copied. The mistake

¹ *καίπερ* is not used by Lysias, 2. 6; 6. 11 belongs to Pseudo-Lysias.

may have been made either in *a* or in the archetype itself. Even if the reading of the *a*-family is preferred it does not strengthen the case for *καίροι* with the participle, as it must be explained with Abicht as *καίπερ* strengthened by the addition of *τοί* and it would be better to write *καί τοί περ*. Such a division of *καί . . . περ* would be very improbable in a prose author.

The construction of *καίροι* with the participle is then entirely post-classic.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

The Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon. By CONSTANCE PESSELS, Ph. D., Instructor in English in the University of Texas. Strassburg, Karl J. Trübner, 1896. Pp. 83.

The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. By MORGAN CALLAWAY, Jr., Professor of English in the University of Texas. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, vol. XVI, No. 2, pp. 141-360. Baltimore, 1901.

During the eight years since the publication of the first part of Dr. J. E. Wülfing's exhaustive work on the Syntax of Alfred, the field of Old English syntax has attracted fewer investigators than for several years previously. On this side of the Atlantic there have appeared but three additions to the list of monographs in my "Bibliographical Guide" (1895); of these, two are concerned with the same general topic as the earliest American dissertation in the field—the Old English participle.

The first, Dr. Pessels' treatise on "The Present and Past Periphrastic Tenses in Anglo-Saxon," bears the imprint of Trübner, of Strassburg; but, when one discovers that a typical page (28) contains eleven obvious errors in printing, and that the word "progressive" is spelled somewhat indifferently with one *s* and with two, one cannot suppress the thought that if the author had not time for the requisite proof-reading, he should have employed a printer nearer home, and one whose native language was English.

Unfortunately, this carelessness is not confined to the printing of the book; it is characteristic. The author's work is conceived on sufficiently broad lines; his collections may fairly claim to be exhaustive; but one feels at every turn that his whole heart has not been in his work, and that details of every sort have been slighted. Thus (p. 18, foot), he makes *indicative* (in the abbreviation *ind.*) and *deponent* (*dep.*) correlative terms. Again, his arithmetic is faulty: on p. 67, he makes $\frac{12}{17}$ only 3% (instead of 15%) greater than $\frac{1}{17}$. In fact, one need not go further than the title-page: the word "periphrastic" applies equally to all compound tenses; but the author uses it in a restricted sense, for the forms made up of the verb *to be* with present participles, without deeming it at all necessary to give notice of the fact.

To proceed to matters of more importance, the constitution of his quotations is extremely careless; they are often so short as

to be of no practical value for the illustration of his statements. No device, other than three tables—only the first of which can be regarded as of conclusive value—, has been introduced for making the work easy of comprehension at a glance. The work throughout is monotonous and unrelieved; until the reader is driven to suspect that the lack of perspective in the book is but the reflection of a similar lack in the author's mind.

Dr. Pessels' results, so far as they concern the verb-forms under survey, are open to little objection; he derives these from the compound tenses of Latin, and properly lays much stress on the influence of the Latin deponent verbs. But in the treatment of the *functions* of these forms, the author is fairly beyond his depth. Nothing shows this more clearly than a strange and apparently quite unconscious inexactness in the use of terms, which greatly detracts from the value and authority of his statements. He nowhere makes a sharp discrimination—nor, so far as can be seen, does he even realize that discrimination is desirable—between progressive and durative uses of the past tense, nor is he able to see any essential difference between "was going" and "used to go"; yet, in his final chapter, he repeatedly uses the term "progressive" as if it were, to him and to his readers, a word of absolutely definite meaning. It may well be so to his readers; but the source of their information will not have been this monograph.

Again, the author has apparently quite failed to realize that the exact shade of meaning expressed by a given verb cannot be determined either by guess-work or by lottery. In his Introduction, after reviewing the utterances of past grammarians upon the subject in hand, he proposes to "record" all the occurrences of periphrastic tenses in Old English, and so to decide where doctors have disagreed. A record may perhaps be sufficient for establishing the origin of verb-forms—these frequently demand the consideration of nothing outside themselves; thus far Pessels is successful. But the study of verbal functions is a matter of much greater complexity. Here the whole sentence must be included in the view. It is true that the verb is one of the most elementary components of the sentence, but it is no less true that the reasons for the employment of a given verb-form, and no other—and these reasons are the goal of Dr. Pessels' quest—can be accurately determined only after all the other components which enter into the expression of the complete idea have been duly weighed. For example, nothing would be of so great assistance in determining the presence of "progressive" force in a given verb, or its absence from it, as to know whether it occurs in a principal or a secondary clause, and the relation of the tenses in the two clauses; if the word "progressive" has any meaning in grammar, it denotes the progress of an action relatively—either to present time, or to that of some other action. Flamme, quoted by Pessels, p. 5, has already pointed out that "*Gleichzeitigkeit*" is

one of the leading ideas expressed by the Old English periphrastic tenses. And yet Pessels never even tells us, except possibly by a mere accident, whether the sentence contains any other verb beside the one under view, to say nothing of more detailed information. He is sadly deficient in perception of what is essential to the discussion. He ignores points of prime importance, and then wastes time in such fruitless labor as the separate treatment of all his subjunctives; considerations of mode are absolutely foreign to his problem.

He does indeed draw a line between the cases in which the periphrastic form has a "temporal modifier" and those in which it has not, a distinction which might be of some value. But he undertakes no classification of these modifiers, according as they express point of time, duration, repetition, goal, etc.; so that, in the paragraph (pp. 59 ff.) where occurs the fullest discussion of the subject, accusatives of extent, adverbs like *dæghwamlíce*, and *oð ðaet* clauses are all united as "denoting continuance." Moreover, the collection is very carelessly made; I may perhaps be pardoned for printing a list, by no means exhaustive, of errors from Bede. Among cases "accompanied by a temporal modifier," figures wrongly 348, 4: "*Ne þinre forþfore swa neah is, nu þu þus rotlice and þus glædlice to us sprecende eart*," where the author has mistaken the conjunction *nu* for an adverb. Among those "without a temporal modifier," occur 94, 11: "*he nu hwonne on þam ilcan bið on wuldre arisende*" (*nu hwonne* = Lat. *quandoque*, which the author probably took for a conjunction); 398, 26: "*wæs ic in ða ærestan tid minre geoguðhadnisse in his geferscipe drohtigende*"; 108, 8: "*he ða (= ðissum tidum, ante) wæs smeagende mid þone . . . papan Bonifatii*"; 202, 25 (should be 26) "*þa wæs he . . . noht feorr from þære byrig, þe we ær foresprecende wæron*."

Criteria were at hand for enabling the author to get results approaching definiteness; but he has apparently preferred to classify his examples by inspiration. Inspiration is, however, at least in linguistic matters, sadly subject to moods; and figures, such as those in the tables on pp. 52 f., which are based upon it, can be accepted only as expressions of temporary opinion or feeling. "Historical perfects" there may be here; but the author has carefully refrained from telling us how he distinguished them from other uses of the past tense.

So much for the general aspects of the work; a few special points may be worthy of mention. On p. 23, in Bede 346, 29, *on æfenne þære neahle þe he of worulde gongende wæs*, the verb is grouped with others as a "Future Preterite"; this may be worth noting as an early example of our familiar use of "is going" and "is coming" with future force (cf. French *je vais*, especially in periphrases like *je vais acheter* = I am going to buy). An exhaustive study of this interesting development of verbs of motion, in our own and other languages (cf. Lat. *amatum iri*), would be a pretty piece of work.

In the same paragraph, when he says that three other cases from Bede (212, 25 (2); 108, 11), which correspond to a Latin future participle, "express the Future Preterite," the author fails to note that, owing to a complete change of construction in the Old English version, all future sense is lost; these three verbs express simple past time, though the employment of the periphrastic *form* may well be due to the influence of the Latin participle.

On p. 56, Pessels discusses the interesting double glosses (e. g. *læg vel licgende wæs*) in the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels; he feels that these are due to a conflict in the author's mind between form and signification. Those which gloss Latin deponent perfects are accounted for on the ground of form. But those which correspond to imperfects cannot be explained so easily; and here Pessels performs one of his most astonishing feats. As a fundamental statement, he "assumes" that "the periphrasis has something of the force of the Modern English progressive"; and says that the glossator has regarded it as appropriate here because of the progressive idea inherent in the Latin imperfect (this statement is too strong; the Latin imperfect is a tense of relative time, but by no means always of progressive force; the author must not be misled by the "*amabam* = I was loving" of the school-grammars). Pessels then continues (p. 57), "that there should be some *weakening* of the progressive force (after this violent transference from Modern to Old English) is not surprising, but that this force *continued* in the periphrasis is amply testified by the examples here collected, and its final triumph in the subsequent history of the language." (Italics and parenthesis are mine.) This is a rarely good example of the interesting mental process known as *Circulus in Probando*. The result is not necessarily wrong; *licgende wæs* may have distinctively progressive force; but "assumption" is not the best means of convincing us that such is the case.

P. 58 (cf. p. 15), from Logeman's "Rule of St. Benet," Pessels cites three occurrences (he omits 26, 7, which is similar) of the present participle with *to*; all these gloss Latin gerundives, by the form of which they were undoubtedly influenced, as both terminate in *-end* (in fact, one instance, *smeagenda*, 26, 11, seems to have taken over *-enda* bodily from *requirenda*). The author fails to note that in 5, 14, *sin to gereccanne* and *lichama haligre beboda gehirsumnesse to campiede*, the participial form is coordinated with an inflected infinitive in *-enne*, of which it is here the equivalent and variant. All these cases are then infinitives of corrupt form, and have no place in Dr. Pessels' field.

It is a pleasure to turn from this immature work to a new study from the hand of Dr. Callaway, the earliest and best known of American investigators in Old English syntax. His treatise on "The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon" is marked by all the qualities which made his study of The Absolute Participle so admirable; while the passage of twelve years has not un-

naturally added to the breadth and grasp of the author's view, the authority of his treatment, and the catholicity of his whole attitude.

The work, like its predecessor, is divided into seven sections: (1) Statistics, (2) Uses, and (3) Origin of the Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon, (4) Anglo-Saxon rendering of the Latin Appositive Participle, (5) Origin of the construction in the other Germanic languages, (6) the Anglo-Saxon Appositive Participle as a Norm of Style, and (7) a brief summary chapter of "Results." Owing to the far greater mass of material handled—3010 cases, as against 349—some of these chapters (especially, of course, the first) are much longer than the corresponding ones in the dissertation of 1889; but the treatment is at once compact without being crowded, and clear and adequate, while avoiding diffuseness. It can, I think, never be charged against Dr. Callaway that his data are meagre or his quotations too short; on the other hand, his judicious employment of tables and of skilful devices of printing makes economy of space entirely compatible with good perspective and complete lucidity.

Dr. Callaway preserves unchanged his early respectful attitude toward other investigators; he is agreeably free from that cocksureness which so often detracts from the effect of work of this sort; but the present treatise is marked by greater independence than his earlier study, and his *obiter dicta* give evidence of an increasingly philosophical attitude toward life, as well as toward the narrow problems of syntax. Independence, however, does not mean insistence, in Dr. Callaway's case; in fact, if there is an opposing view, he is the first to call attention to it; if any of his results are open to query, he prefers to raise the query himself. He pursues his own road in reaching his conclusions, but the whole work is marked by an unwillingness to dogmatize which is one of its chief recommendations.

The atmosphere of Pessels' book is murky, or at least hazy—one sees but a few things, and those indistinctly; but Callaway's work is full of light; definition and classification are alike simple, clear, concise. In fact, the present monograph offers a contrast to Pessels' work at almost every point; and one could hardly have a better preparation than a reading of the latter if he would properly appreciate the care which Callaway has expended upon every least detail of his work.

The author conceives the scope of the term "appositive" as a broad one: he applies it not only to participles which express an adverbial idea, but to those which are equivalent to a relative clause. He defends this liberal interpretation skilfully (especially by means of the examples on pp. 272 f.), and (p. 149) urges the general acceptance of "appositive participle" as a grammatical category with an application similar in all respects to that of "noun in apposition."

After giving some guesses at the probable order of development of the various uses of the participle, he turns with apparent relief

from the region of speculation to "matters about which a reasonable degree of certainty is possible," and treats of the inflexion and the position (prevailingly postpositive) of the appositive participle.

One cannot help admiring the author's clearness of arrangement in the long chapter (112 pages) of statistics; the examples occurring in each work of Old English prose and poetry are listed separately, while figures are introduced at every step to show exactly the relations of part to whole. (It is only fair to Dr. Pessels to say that he follows the same plan, the excellence of which is, however, largely obscured in his case by the clumsiness of the printing.) The schematic arrangement of Callaway's work is usually quite free from the woodenness which so often characterizes German work of this sort. But, in his desire to give formal balance to his statistics from the Boethius (pp. 167 f.), the author has twice introduced the caption, "II. With an Object (o)", followed by the grave statement, "No example." An American cannot afford to waste space and printer's ink in this fashion. At the end of the chapter, the statistical results are brought together into a two-page table which shows all the significant facts at a glance, with summations so frequent as to give one control of every step in the author's processes, and to answer one's questions almost before they arise.

The art of constructing tables is one in which Dr. Callaway is especially strong; those which follow and summarize Chap. II (pp. 292-296), exhibiting the "uses" of the appositive participle, and Chap. III (pp. 315-320), showing the Latin equivalents of the participles in Old English translations, are triumphs of lucidity.

The author draws his lines of classification between prose and poetry; between present and past tenses; and between participles with an object and those without. His interpretation of the term "object" with past participles is a very liberal one; it includes any noun-modifier of the participle. He would probably not put this forward as a definition, but for his purpose—the determination of the peculiarly verbal element in these participles—the extension has a practical value.

It is impossible that in so large a collection there should not be some cases in the classification of which any two investigators would differ. The distinction between the attributive and appositive uses of the participle is largely one of emphasis: if the idea expressed by the participle is the one of chief importance—if it is a *necessary* qualification—the participle is likely to be attributive, and to precede its noun; but, as it gradually loses in emphasis, and becomes first simply descriptive, and then the mere addition of something more or less extraneous, it becomes appositive, and tends to follow its noun. I should incline to regard two examples on p. 223—Luke I, 27 and Matt. XI, 7—as attributive. Again, as the author suggests, it is difficult to distinguish sharply between adverbial uses of the participle and

those which are equivalent to modal clauses. Callaway lists a number of such cases on p. 275, where he makes the excellent suggestion that these expressions are properly not participles, but participial adverbs, and should be so called, as in the grammar of other languages. It seems to me that the negative element in *unwandiende* (Greg. 381, 25, p. 171), *ungewitnode* (Greg. 117, 23, p. 174), and *ungeniedde* (Greg. 137, 19, ib.) sets them beyond question in the same category.

Like Pessels—only with a vast difference—Callaway gives the Latin originals, where they exist, of all his examples. One of his captions constantly appears in the form: "An A.-S. appositive participle corresponds to a Latin finite verb, which finite verb is usually in immediate connection with an appositive participle." This statement seems too strong; in 9 out of 23 occurrences, the Latin verb has no participle near it. In one case (p. 185, Benedict 22, 10), where *myngað clypiende* = Lat. *clamat dicens*, *dicens*, rather than *clamat*, should probably be given as the source of *clypiende*.

P. 230, Note 2, Callaway mentions some examples of "pure adverbs" from The Rule of St. Benet. The study of glosses can, it seems to me, have but slight value for syntactical purposes: the evidence which they furnish may be confirmatory of results gained elsewhere, but taken alone it is a very insufficient ground for any opinion whatever. The glosses are little more than collections of English words; it is only by mere chance that they ever contain real English sentences. *Teonde*, in the two examples cited, may "seem in use to be a pure adverb"; but all one can say with certainty is that the glossator set it down as the nearest approach *in form* to *subtrahendo* and *protrahendo*, respectively. The corresponding passages from Benedict, which Dr. Callaway subjoins in brackets, show how a *translator* treated these Latin words. It would seem that Callaway gives himself quite too much anxiety over Benet. In a note on p. 229, he gravely defines six present participles found there as verbal nouns, though the usage has no parallel elsewhere; this would be very interesting were Benet not a gloss; as it is, the suggestion cannot be taken seriously. The author forgets that he is dealing with what the Germans would call "Unenglisch."

Under "conditional uses" (p. 285), Callaway lists ten cases of the familiar expression "*geteled rime(s)*", following numerals, from the poetry. His second thought on these cases (pp. 305f.) is better: here he says, "the participle is not unmistakably conditional," and "its use appears to have been phraseological, rather than syntactical." We have to do here with a pure idiomatic construction; the user was quite unconscious of *geteled* as a separate syntactical element in the sentence; the exact analysis of such expressions would be possible only in a more primitive stage of the language.

Some of Callaway's notes on minor points in passing are suggestive. The discussion of a number of participles from the

Gospels, hitherto cited as appositive (pp. 224 f.), is interesting; though in Luke IX, 34, it is just as easy to take *him* as reflexive dative with *ondredon* (in which case *gangende* is appositive), as to say that it combines with *gangende* to form a "crude" absolute dative; on its face, the former explanation is the natural one; the Latin original, *intransibis illis*, lends color to the latter. On p. 225, Professor Bright, as editor, inserts a footnote, still maintaining his position in regard to "*hine bewend*," (= *conversus*, Luke IX, 55), where, according to his view, *hine* is carried over from the active voice.

Callaway's attitude (p. 291) toward the "pleonastic *and*," which often occurs with participles, is very sane, as is his treatment on the preceding page of "supplementary particles," added to give color. In the note (p. 290) on Passive Participles in an Active Sense, where he is entirely right in insisting that *druncen* has passive force, he seems to have mistaken the ground-meaning of *forscyldigian* (= "to condemn"); *forscyldigod* (Ælf. Hom. I, 66, 12) is no less passive than *druncen*.

Callaway reaches the conclusion that the spirit of Old English was favorable only to those appositive participles which had pronounced adjectival (descriptive) force; and that those with clearly verbal force are either not appositive or not of native origin. For example, the participles which denote manner are numerous in the poetry and original prose, and are thus probably native; but those denoting means, which retain more of their verbal character, can practically always be traced to a Latin source. The author is able to show that, common and natural as it seems, the temporal use, except of a very few participles of but slight verbal force, is not native to our language. Moreover, the Old English present participle, when used appositively, had not originally the power of governing a direct object; while of the appositive preterite participle with a direct object, there is in all the literature only the single doubtful case mentioned above (Luke IX, 55, *hine bewend*).

As one reads the section on the Governing Power of the Participle (pp. 307-314), one can hardly escape the feeling that here, if anywhere, the author's ingenuity has got the better of him. In no part of the book does he show greater command of resources; his arguments, taken separately, are very convincing; but they are too varied—one feels that he is tilting at a mark which he is determined to demolish, and that, for every new face which it shows, he makes a dash from a different quarter. His disposal of a large number of cases from the poetry as accusative compounds is very clever; he shows much insight on this point. But one feels that in inventing Latin sources for all other troublesome cases, his facility is so great as to excite question.

The chapter on Old English renderings of the Latin appositive participle (pp. 321 ff.) is full of interest. The author admits at the outset that "no principle has been consistently followed by

the Anglo-Saxon translators"; this is another example of that ability to make due allowance for individuality in both Anglo-Saxons and modern investigators which is so refreshing a trait throughout the author's work. In section II (pp. 323 ff.), by an odd mistake, his headings read, "The Latin Temporal (Relative, etc.) Clause," where he means the Latin appositive participle equivalent to such a clause.

One of the most valuable features of Callaway's tables, referred to above, is the light they shed on stylistic questions. In his chapter (pp. 344 ff.) on the Anglo-Saxon Appositive Participle as a Norm of Style, the author discusses these facts with admirable liveliness. He shows the value of the construction as an element in Old English style, and almost leaves one with the impression that literary men consciously set about to transplant so valuable a resource from Latin into their own language, and to propagate it there. He illustrates the advance in this point from Alfred to Ælfric by a contrast between New High German and Modern English, and inspires in the reader a feeling of real sympathy for the destitute condition of Alfred and the Germans. He regards the introduction of the appositive present participle with the power of governing an object as the chief contribution of the Late West Saxon writers to English prose style.

There is still left for consideration one of the most important features of the book: I refer to the inclusion, as a separate category, under the name "Co-ordinate Participle," of appositive participles essentially equivalent to independent clauses, which either (1) denote an accompanying circumstance, or (2) repeat the idea of the principal verb. These uses, which are recognized by writers on Greek and Latin syntax, have received scant treatment at the hands of English and Germanic grammarians. A couple of examples will suggest the familiarity of the participle employed in this way: *behyddon his lichaman, secgende* (Ælf. L. S., I, 146, 458); *hy awehton hyne, ðus cweðende* (Matt. VIII, 25). In each case, the participle might as well have been a verb connected by *and*. But, while Callaway does well in frankly accepting this as a new category, and in not attempting to range these examples under the old heads, one feels that the possession of the category has been a constant temptation to him, and that he has used it as a sort of catch-all. Of the 23 cases listed as "Circumstantial" on pp. 286 f., I should be inclined to question all but 8; of the 15 discarded, I regard 3 (Bened. 30, 3; Metres of Boeth. 20, 214, 221) as iterative; the others are, I should say, modal—a possibility which the author himself admits on p. 307. On the latter page, and the one preceding it, may be found another interesting example of Dr. Callaway's ingenuity in the construction of evidence; here he actually goes so far as to cite other writers, against his own earlier statements, as authority for throwing out certain cases which were in the way of his endeavor to establish a Latin source for the "Co-ordinate Use."

There remains only the duty of pointing out a few additional

errors in printing not noted by the author, in a work whose typography is in general as careful as its whole execution is admirable. P. 158, l. 18, for *hauperibus* read *pauperibus*; p. 276, l. 5, for *si* read *se*; p. 287, l. 13, for *immitans* read *imitans*; l. 20, for *Bæth.* read *Boeth.*; l. 29, for *transuivit* read *transiuit*; pp. 345, 346, 347, wherever the difference between Modern English and New High German is compared to that between Alfred and Ælfric, the order should be transposed; it is Alfred, not Ælfric, who is on a par with the Germans.

CENTRAL UNIVERSITY, DANVILLE, KY.

FRANK H. CHASE.

D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae con note di ENRICO CESAREO, Libro I, Satira I (71 pp.); Satira II (50 pp.). Messina, 1900.

It is often the experience of the teacher to take up a new book with pleasurable anticipation, to examine it, at first with eagerness, then with waning interest, and finally to lay it aside in disappointment. Such, I doubt not, will be the feelings of every American student of Juvenal into whose hands may fall the latest foreign edition of this author.

In the preface we are told that the editor has had before him several of the older commentaries as well as the most important editions of the last century except those of Mayor and Lewis. As far as the text is concerned, he professes to follow Friedländer save in a few cases where he has adopted another reading "*dopo matura riflessione*". On questions of etymology—which, by the way, need scarcely be discussed in a work of this sort—he relies on Doderlein (?) and Vansicèk (sic!) and closes his preface with the hope "*La buona intenzione, se non altro, mi procuri il compatimento dell' indulgente lettore*".

An examination of the very full commentary reveals the fact that the editor has contributed very little to the interpretation or illustration of the satires except a few more or less relevant passages from Dante, Ariosto and other Italian poets. Moreover, his knowledge of the recent important literature bearing on his author seems to be confined to what he could gather from Friedländer and Duff. For example, he makes no note of Housman's ingenious and almost certain explanation of I, 144 *intestata senectus* as 'old age unwitnessed' (Class. Rev., XIII, 1899, pp. 432 f.) nor does he mention the Bodleian fragments which furnish the most remarkable illustration of passages in the second satire. In short, the edition of Cesareo seems to serve no good purpose, being far too copious for the young student, and, for reasons suggested, of little value to the teacher and scholar. Fortunately only two parts have as yet appeared, and it is to be hoped, for the sake of all concerned, that the publication will not be carried to completion.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

HARRY LANGFORD WILSON.

REPORTS.

HERMES, XXXVI.

D. Detlefsen. Die Quellenschriften, insbesondere die lateinischen, in B. 10 der Nat. Hist. des Plinius. If we eliminate from Book 10, a treatise on birds, what Pliny clearly took from Aristotle and other Greek sources, and what he expressly derived from Nigidius Figulus, the remainder was taken mainly from Umbricius Melior. For sections 6-28 and 29-42 treat of the *alites* and *oscines*; and these Roman groupings, which interfere with the rest of the classification, derived from Aristotle, to which may be added the content of many passages and some technical expressions, point clearly to a book on Roman augury. Now Pliny mentions several who wrote de Etrusca disciplina, which title included, as we know from Festus, p. 260 f., a section on birds, and of these commends particularly Umbricius Melior as *haruspicum in nostro aevo peritissimus*. This praise, according to Pliny's custom, makes it highly probable that Umbricius was the source for the augural parts, especially as Umbricius, being the youngest of this class of writers and a contemporary, would be preferred by Pliny whose plan was to make his book up-to-date.

O. Seeck. Zur Chronologie des Kaisers Licinius. The year in which Licinius was elevated to the throne is proved to have been 308 A. D. and the year of his abdication, 324 A. D. [Th. Mommsen (Hermes XXXVI, p. 602-5) finds the date 308 A. D. to be correct, but holds to the commonly accepted date 323 A. D., for the overthrow of Licinius.]

W. Radtke. Aristodems 'Επιγράμματα Θεβαϊκά. Aristodemus the Alexandrian, the pupil of Aristarchus, who wrote *περί Πινδάρου* has been identified by v. Wilamowitz with the author of a work on Thebes in which the mythological topography was a prominent feature. This work proves to have been a collection of epigrams with a mythological commentary. The epigrams were approved or declared spurious in the light of literature, Homer being naturally the chief authority to the Aristarchean; besides Corinna, The Thebaïd, Rhianus, Euphron were quoted. The work must have offered much valuable mythographical material from the Theban legends to the compilers and commentators of the first century B. C. This study depends mainly on Theon's commentaries to Lycophron, Theocritus and Apollonius Rhodius, on the scholia to Eurip. Phoen., on the scholia to Homer and on Photius-Hesychius. Pausanias, Bk. IX is a promising field for further investigation.

H. Diels. *Die Olympionikenliste aus Oxyrhynchos*. In this list (vid. *Hermes* XXXV) there occur three passages to which the following enigmatical phrases are appended, according to Grenfell's reading: ὁ κρατισ[.], ὁ φιλις and ὁ καλλισ which Blass resolved in οὗτος κράτιστος, οὗτος φίλιστος and οὗτος κάλλιστος. According to Diels ὁ stands for οὕτως, καλλισ probably for the historian Kallisthenes, who, we have reason to believe, prepared a list of Olympic victors for Aristotle and probably cited them in his history, φιλις for Philistos and reading κρατη, as we should for κρατισ (vid. photo. opp. p. 72), we have a reference to the famous Homeric scholar. The list is not to be attributed to Phlegon, but to a "handbook" of the time of the Empire. The citing of authorities shows that reliable official lists did not exist. The ancient Ὀλυμπιάδων ἀναγραφαί are the result of much learned labor, and while not unreliable we must expect contradictions. The list of Attic archons is more reliable.

B. Graef. *Archäologische Beiträge*. 1. Assteas und die Attische Bühne. Graef argues, against E. Bethe (*Jahrb. d. arch. Instituts* XV 1. 59 ff.), that this vase had nothing to do with the theater. 2. Die Schamhaftigkeit der Skythen. The golden γωρυτός from Nikopol, Russia (*Wiener Vorlegebl.*, Ser. B. pl. 10) is far removed from genuine Attic art and unGreek in the care taken to hide the genitals. 3. Darstellung des Dionysos auf einer Korinthischen Vase. Loeschcke (*Ath. Mitth.* XIX, pl. 8), has published a small Corinthian amphora with the return of Hephaestus. The long-robed figure following Hephaestus, named Thetis by Loeschcke and Aphrodite by v. Wilamowitz, is probably Dionysos. 4. Der Bocksatyr auf einer schwarzfigurigen Vase. The male satyr in Bethe's *Prolegomena zur Gesch. d. Theaters* is not beardless. The back is turned and the beard is hidden by the shoulder. The line taken for the chin is really the mouth. 5. Zur Melischen Gigantomachie. In the vase from Melos (*Monum. grecs*, 1875, pl. I. II, *Wiener Vorlegebl.*, VIII 7), the figure with bow and arrows to the left of the chariot of Ares and Aphrodite is Bendis as shown by the peculiar Thracian head-dress. 6. Die Talosvase. This well-known amphora from Ruvo is not Attic as generally believed, but Apulian.

W. Christ. *Bacchylides und die Pythiadenrechnung*. Based on Bacch. IV, 13 ff., where δύο τ' Ὀλυμπιονίκας must be rendered "two Olympic victories" Christ now concedes to the followers of Bergk that the Pythiads must be reckoned from Ol. 49, 3 not from Ol. 48, 3 as Böckh maintained. (*A. J. P.* XXI 470.)

F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. *Gewichte aus Thera*. A brief account of lava stones used as weights is followed by a long and interesting discussion of the subject by C. F. Lehmann.

F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. *Eine Karneenfeier in Thera*. A reduced drawing (p. 135) shows us an archaic inscription (500 B. C.)

of five nearly perfect lines, the oldest evidence as to the Carnean festival on Thera (cf. Pindar, Pyth. V 75 ff.):

Ἀγλωτέλης πρᾶτιστος ἀγορὰν ἡικάδι
 Κα[ρ]νῆια θεὸν δειπν[ι]ξεν ἡο[ύ]ριπαντίδα
 καὶ Λακαρτῶς.

Translated: "Agloteles the son of Enipantidas and Lakarto, first in public speaking, gave the god on 20. [Carnean] a Carnean feast." The date shows that the period from the 7th to the 15th of the Carnean month did not hold for all places. The site of the inscription near the only important spring on the island, the Zoodochos Pege, where even to-day the people resort to mix their wine, points to the rural character of the festival, such as the Διονύσια κατ' ἀγρούς celebrated at a later season of the year in Attica.

M. Wellmann. Zu den Αἰτιολογούμενα des Soran.

Miscellen. E. Klostermann. Κομίατον, commeatus.—F. Blass. Zu den neuen Fragmenten aus Hesiods Katalogen.—C. Robert. Die Phorkiden.—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. Der Bildhauer Antiphanes.

Ad. Brieger. Das Atomistische System durch Correctur des Anaxagoreischen Entstanden. The Atomistic system of philosophy is not to be derived from the Eleatic. Theophrastus recognized the strong contrast between the two, and Aristotle probably did not intend to give an historical account in *de gen. et corr.* I 8. 325^a 23 ff. Assuming Leucippus, whose very existence has been questioned, to have founded the Atomistic school, it can still be shown that the origin of the system must be derived from Anaxagoras. Leucippus was probably the younger. Further, the influence of the Anaxagorean sensualism must not be restricted to the later phase of Atomism of Democritus, as the earlier stage of Leucippus bears the same marks. Finally, both taught that every object contained an infinite number of elementary particles; but whereas the impossibility of this in the case of the *ἄτομα* is striking, the difficulty is less apparent with the infinitely divisible *ὁμοιομερῆ*. Anaxagoras' system shows elements of progress over the Eleatic; its faults needed but to be recognized. The supposition of a void was comparatively easy; but to make the conception of indivisible particles plausible, they had to be represented as differently constituted from things as we see them. The modification of Anaxagoras' system at this point was an achievement of a high order. Both systems explain phenomena by means of the senses, guided by the understanding, in sharp contrast with the Eleatics. Thus the Atomistic system in its fundamental principles was developed through a correction of that of Anaxagoras. The older philosophies may have exerted a certain influence only. Though Theophrastus says that Parmenides was Leucippus' teacher, yet he could hardly have done more than sharpen his wits. That Anaxagoras in the history of philosophy should ever have been placed after the Atomists is

due to Plato (Phaed. c. 46-48), who praises him for his doctrine of the *νοῦς*, and following Plato, modern scholars have regarded Anaxagoras' system as a bridge from the physicists to the Socratics.

U. Wilcken. Zu den Pseudo-Aristotelischen Oeconomica. The collection of historical examples in Book 2 of the Oeconomica is in its origin a distinct work, made by a contemporary soon after 323 B. C. and that possibly at the suggestion of Aristotle (Polit. I 1259^a 3 ff.). The words in l. c. I 8 *τινες τῶν πρότερον* refer indeed to events long past (Niebuhr), but they were probably added by the Peripatetic who, say about 250 B. C. added this collection to his theoretic discussion. Some of the stories have their parallels in Polyaeus and others and are usually inferior to those of the former; but this is hardly due to the original collector. They deserve more attention than has been given them.

Th. Mommsen. Die Diocletianische Reichspraefectur.

G. Thiele. Ionisch-Attische Studien. The authenticity of the Gorgias speeches has not yet been generally recognized, because the stylist is commonly separated from the personality of the man, which was shallow. Besides his style requires a deeper study. Norden has shown that we can no longer speak strictly of Gorgianic figures, and yet Gorgias uses them in a manner peculiarly his own. This peculiarity consists in a certain progression of sound to sound comparable to the movement in music from chord to chord, hence Thiele calls it the *Motiv*. This often determined the thought as rhyme will do in poetry. The Helen illustrates this principle best, and viewed as a *παίγμιον* awakens admiration for the skill displayed by the old rhetorician. It was one of his last productions. The key to the understanding of Gorgias' art is alliteration, which also throws light on his dialect. Besides we must accept an accent of stress along with the tonic accent, as in Helen 11 *πλάσαντες—πάντες*, Palamedes 15. *σύνιστε—σύνιστε*. The second example needs a stress on the penult to bring out the contrast. Isocrates' Helen has also been depreciated from a failure to see that it is an allegorical sermon on beauty. Gorgias' Helen is plainly referred to in Helen 14. *φησὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐγκώμιον γεγραφέναι περὶ αὐτῆς, τυγχάνει δ' ἀπολογίαν εἰρηκώς*. For it is strictly an apology, though spoken of at the end as an encomium; an unusual place for a title; but so cleverly put as to be worthy of the famous rhetorician. Isocrates does not mention his name in this connection, as the Helen was published anonymously. As regards the relative chronology of the two Helens and the Phaedrus it is unfortunate that the lower limits of Gorgias' life should be 362-58 according to Thiele's data, instead of 382-79 as he puts it.

F. Blass. Nachlese zu Bacchylides.

M. Ihm. Die sogenannte 'Villa Iouis' des Tiberius auf Capri und andere Suetoniana.

Miscellen.—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Venus von Milo.—v. Wilamowitz. Eine Handschrift

des Kallimachos.—F. Blass. Zu Aristophanes' Froeschen.—Karl Hude. Ueber γάρ in Appositiven Ausdrücken.—Ulrich Wilcken. ὁ δ' ἐρύγγος χαρακτήρ.—G. F. Hill. Τετράδραχμον χρυσούν.—C. F. Lehmann. Zu den Ephemeriden Alexanders d. Grossen.

P. Stengel. Zu den Griechischen Sacralalterthümern. As the Homeric Greek was free to omit libations (vid. *Hermes*, 34, 474) so the slaying of animals for household use was not necessarily accompanied by sacrifice. When later he lost his faith in the actual participation of the god, sacrifices became symbolical, and with the increased number of sacred rites came a rigid adherence to their performance. In Homer there are only beginnings of a ritual. The word *ἐνδορα* occurs for the first time in No. 37 of Paton and Hicks' inscriptions from Cos in the phrase *ἐνδορα ἐνδέπεται*. It must mean the same as *σπλάγχνα* and in the ceremony described it would appear that the vitals were wrapped in the skin and offered to the god on the hearth in the temple.

Th. Preger. Das Gründungsdatum von Konstantinopel. On May 11, 330 A. D., the new imperial residence on the Bosphorus was inaugurated; but Constantine began to adorn the old city with magnificent buildings in July or August of 325 A. D., and on Nov. 26, 328 began to extend the walled limits of the city. However later, as the day of inauguration in 330 seemed more important to the emperor, the earlier dates were forgotten.

M. Ihm. Beiträge zur Textgeschichte des Sueton.

C. Robert. Archäologische Nachlese. (vid. *Hermes* 35) XV. Illustrationen zu einem griechischen Roman. The wall paintings from the house discovered 1879 near the villa Farnesina do not represent the fabulous judgments of the Egyptian king Bokchoris as suggested by Mau and Loewy, but the romantic history of two adventurers. XVI. Niobe auf einem pompeianischen Marmorbild. The source of this painting is Sophocles' Niobe as shown by the fragments published by Grenfell and Hunt. It furnishes the only representation of a *σκηνή* of the fifth century and proves Dörpfeld's theory of the stage. XVII. Iliasscenen in der Altkorinthischen Vasenmalerei. New interpretations are reached by observing that the Corinthian vase painters of the sixth century knew their Homer at least as well as the Athenian of the fifth. XVIII. Iliasscene auf griechischen Sarkophagen. Vietty's drawing of the sarcophagus near Sparta (Raoul Rochette, *Mon. inéd. pl.* LIX, 2-5) represents the battle at the ships, as shown by a comparison with five copies of the same scene. XIX. Bendis oder Iris? The Thracian head-dress discussed by Graef above is worn by Iris on the Petersburg vase (Wiener Vorlegebl., Ser. A. Pl. II. 1) proving that Iris is represented on the Melian vase.

F. Blass. Die Pseudippokratische Schrift *Περὶ Φυσῶν* und der Anonymus Londinensis.—Berichtigung zur Seite 310.—O. Lagercrantz. The Delphic E represented *ἦ*, meaning "he spoke".

F. Bechtel. Varia.

1. Εὔσοος. In Theocritus XXIV 8.

εὔδερ' ἐμὰ ψυχά, δὺ' ἀδελφεῶ, εὔσοα τέκνα.

the word εὔσοος is to be connected with the verb σεύω. Ancient testimony glosses the adjective with εὐκίνητος, εὐφορος and the noun with εὐθένεια.

2. Στροβήλη. This enigmatical name (Κατὰ Νεαίρας 50) should be Στροιβήλη, and so allied with the well-known Στροῖβος, as ἐρύγηλος is with ἐρυγμός.

3. Boeotian ἔττε. This is not from ἔστε as Brugmann thinks, since the combinations στ, σθ are found. The western Locrians and the Phocians, who were unfamiliar with the augmented ἐν-ε used ἔντε, and for the same reason we should expect a Boeotian ἔντε. Führer and Prellwitz derive ἔττε from ἔντε, with a reference to ἔμπασις > ἔππασις, yet since Joh. Schmidt has shown that the latter passed through the stage ἔμπασις so we must posit a prehistoric ἐν-ττε. But what was—ττε?

W. Janell. Ueber die Echtheit und Abfassungszeit des Theages. Its non-Platonic character can be seen in the extravagant account of the daimonion, and of Socrates' magnetic power, which reveals a tendency, which unchecked would have made a magician of Socrates. It is not an imitation of the Laches with which it has only a similar subject in common. Nor is the error (Theages, 125 B) in assigning a Sophoclean verse to Euripides taken from Repub., VIII 568 A., for this seems to have been a common mistake. A close relation, however, does exist between Theages, 129 E—130 A. ff. and Theaetetus 150 C. ff.; but here Plato himself criticizes certain views expressed in the Theages. This gives us a *terminus ante quem*. A *terminus post quem* is furnished by the Apology and Alcibiades I so that the Theages was composed between 369 and 365 B. C.

F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. Inschriften von Rhodos und Thera.

Miscellen.—A. Wilhelm. Θεοὶ ἐπικούριοι.—Epigramm aus As-typalaia.—W. Dittenberger. Zum Brief des Antigonos an die Skepsier.—F. Hiller v. Gaertringen. Hermes Kypharissiphas.

Th. Preger. Konstantinos—Helios.

The bronze statue that surmounted the "burned column" at Constantinople up to 1106 A. D. was not an Apollo by Phidias as reputed, but a Helios of the Hellenistic or Roman period. The Sun-worship of Constantine is certain. That he had not changed as late as 330 is shown by his having the above statue set up in the forum in that year. At the same time he ordered a gilded Helios of wood for the *Pompa circensis*, with injunctions as regards its use each succeeding year.

W. H. Roscher. Neue Beiträge zur Deutung des delphischen Ε.

The fame of the Delphic E shows that it was one of the famous sayings, hence could not stand simply for η (vid. Lagercrantz above).

The following hexameters may lay claim to some degree of probability:

Εἰ. Θεῶ ἦρα. Νόμοις πείθεν. Φεῖδεν σὺ χρόνιοι.
Γνώθι σεαυτὸν. Μηδὲν ἄγαν. Ἐγγύα, πάρα δ' ἄτη.

C. Robert in a brief note suggests that the Delphic E was originally an object which merely resembled an E.

O. Kern. *Magnetische Studien.*

An account of the festival of Artemis Leucophryene marks the beginning of a projected series of articles intended to elucidate the inscriptions from Magnesia. This festival dates from the epiphany of the goddess 221-20 B. C. But the first attempt to honor the goddess proved abortive, then about 202 B. C. a panhellenic festival took place. The postponement was principally due to the political situation; but also to the desire to complete certain projected buildings, as shown by hasty workmanship. After the great event the long stoa erected for the expected visitors, had its walls inscribed with the letters and decrees sent by princes and states in response to the invitations. The records show only one more celebration after this one. The lack of individuality of the Magnesian Artemis probably caused an early decline of her glory.

Th. Mommsen. *Aetius.*

We have here, based on the original sources, a fresh history of the Roman general Aetius, including a sketch of the Huns, improved in detail and historical sequence. Appended to this is a study of the Roman office of general, the main source of which is the *Notitia dignitatum*, which was begun in the time of Constantine I, but finally revised as we have it, about 425 A. D.

W. Crönert. *Die Logikā Zetēmata des Chrysippos und die übrigen Papyri logischen Inhalts aus der herculanensischen Bibliothek.*

F. Blass. *Kritische Bemerkungen zu Platon's Phaidros.* The application of a rhythmical test to Plato increases indeed the difficulties of textual criticism; but ensures richer and safer results. In answer to a charge of radicalism Blass defends some longer passages that have been rejected by Schanz. Interpolations of such length do not occur in the Phaedrus.

E. Bethe. *Thymeliker und Skeniker.*

The Hellenistic *θυμελικοί ἀγῶνες* with their choruses made use of the whole orchestra, which was known as *θυμέλη* from the time of Pratinas. In contrast dramatic performances were called from their characteristic locality *σκηνικοί ἀγῶνες*, as proved by inscriptions of the 2nd and 3d centuries B. C. This distinction, known to Vitruvius (V. 8.), goes back to about 300 B. C.

Th. Mommsen. *Consularia* (Nachtrag zu Bd. 32, S. 538). See above *Zur Chronologie des Kaisers Licinius*.

Geo. Kaibel. *Sententiarum Liber Ultimus*.

Miscellen.—F. Bechtel. *Zur Entschädigungsurkunde von Trözen*.—P. Groebe. *Das Geburtsjahr und die Heimath des M. Caelius Rufus*.—M. Ihm. *Zu Julius Valerius*.—P. Stengel. *Nachtrag zu S. 332*.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

PHILOLOGUS, LVIII (N. F. XII) 1899.

I, pp. 1-24. Ferd. Noack. *Das Proskenion in der Theaterfrage*. N. reaches a different conclusion from Bethe (*Hermes* 32, 320 ff.). There were two distinct types of theaters (p. 19), the Hellenistic with proscenium ornamented with columned façade before which the action took place in the orchestra; and that of Asia Minor, without the columns, in which the action was on the pulpitum proscenii. Vitruvius gives rules for making a 'normal' Greek theater, with features from both types, but as regards the stage he follows the type of Asia Minor. Thus the strongest of ancient authorities cited against Doerpfeld is got out of the way.

II, pp. 25-44. Alfred Gudeman. *Zur Germania des Tacitus*. *Germani* in 2, 14 would have been understood by the Romans as 'brothers.' We cannot tell for what native word it originally stood. *ac nunc Tungri* is to be considered a gloss. 9, 5 ff. read *Liburnicae*, 13, 6 *certis* for *ceteris*, 19, 13 transpose *maritum* and *matrimonium*, which passage G. thinks was corrupted by a wrong resolution of compendia. 23, 4 *si indulseris ebrietate* ff. is rejected on linguistic and other grounds, 33, 1 read *paene tum* for *penitus*, 43, 2 read *cludunt*, 46, 10 read *usu ac*. The MS tradition is upheld in: 4, 1. 11, 3. 11, 12. 15, 1. 22, 9. 46, 4.

III, pp. 45-51. L. Gurlitt. *Atius pigmentarius und Verwandtes*. (Zu Cicero ad fam. XV, 17, 3.) Cicero in writing to Cassius jokingly refers to Octavian by a pseudonym, Atius (his grandfather's name) and 'pigmentarius', from his great-grandfather's trade (*unguentarius*, v. Suet. Vit. Div. Aug. 4).

IV, pp. 52-76. H. Pomtow. *Delphische Inschriften*. The inscriptions of the east wall. Two plates and two cuts.

V, pp. 77-87. H. Lewy. *Parallelen zu antiken Sprichwörtern und Apophthegmen*. Thirty-two proverbs are illustrated by parallels mostly drawn from the Hebrew scriptures, Talmud, Midrasch and other Semitic writings.

VI, pp. 88-110. K. Münscher. *Die Isokratesüberlieferung*. Reply to E. Drerup, *Philologus* 55, 1896, p. 667 ff. We cannot

leap over 800 years from our four principal MSS to an archetype of the first or second century. There are two forms of the text. In the course of the first century A. D. the critical editions of Caecilius of Caleacte and Dionysius became the standard. The former accepted 28, the latter 25 speeches. Thus not 60 but the smaller number came to be circulated by the publishers.

VII, pp. 111-120. R. Helm. *Daphnis bei Theokrit*. Theocritus, like Vergil, Ovid and Nonnus, outlines this personage with freedom, and the myth of Daphnis must not be appealed to in the analysis of the idyll for supporting erroneous readings, e. g. vs. 85.

VIII, pp. 121-131. Eb. Nestle. *Zur Rekonstruktion der Septuaginta*. Especially the methods used by the martyr, Lucian of Antioch in his revision.

IX, pp. 132-147. A. Dammann. *Der Anfang des peloponnesischen Krieges*, p. 147: The hitherto accepted statement that the surprise of Plataeae by the Thebans was the beginning of the Peloponnesian War cannot be proved from Thucydides. From the historical standpoint and according to Thuc. it is not the surprise of Plataeae, but the first invasion of Attica by the Peloponnesians that was the beginning of the war. The words cited from V 20 ἡ ἐσβολὴ ἡ ἐς τὴν Ἀττικὴν are accordingly genuine.

Miscellen.—Pp. 148-160. 1, pp. 148-154. E. Goebel. *Kritische und exegetische Beiträge zu Cicero's Tuskulanen*.

2, pp. 154-5. M. Petschenig. *Zu spätlateinischen Schriftstellern*. Eight notes on Aurelius Victor, Caes. 3. 8, 14. 8, 19. 8, 20. 13; Marcellinus, Com. ad a. 512: 518 (Momms.).—Victor Tonnennensis ad a. 510, Origo Constant. 4, 12 (Momms.).

3, pp. 155-156. M. Maas. *Eine neue Deutung des Kalbträgers im Akropolis-Museum*. From Aristophanes Ach. 13 ἐπὶ μύσῳ it is suggested that the familiar archaic figure was a dedicatory statue of some victorious citharoedus.

4, pp. 157-160. M. Maas. *Juvenal und Josephus Iscanus*. Manitius, *Römische Dichter im Mittelalter*, Juvenal, Philol. N. F. IV, failed to mention the English monk Josephus Iscanus of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries whose poem contains many imitations of Juvenal. It is also suggested that Shakespeare may have known this poem and used it in *Troilus and Cressida*.

P. 160. P. v. Winterfeld. *Zu Juvenal Sat. IV 9*. In Abelard to Heloise, ep. VII, *vitiata* appears for *vitata*. *vitiata* appears in Jahn's ed. of 1851.

X, pp. 161-169. L. Radermacher. *Dinarchus*, p. 169: For information about the life of Dinarchus, we have two sources of some importance, one in Dionysius, the other in Pseudo-Plutarch. After eliminating the traces of a worthless pre-Dionysian tradition, we get in the latter a biography written after Dionysius, based on the oration against Proxenus, fixing details more precisely or

modifying them, and recognizing a greater number of orations as genuine. It claims a certain independence, and can, not without probability, be referred to Caecilius of Caleacte.

XI, pp. 170-204. W. v. Voigt. Unter welchen Gestirnen wurden Caesar, Agrippa und Tiberius geboren? A contribution to the interpretation and dating of the *Astronomica* of Manilius. Caesar was born under Scorpio, Tiberius under Libra, Agrippa perhaps under Sagittarius (p. 197). The poem was published under Tiberius perhaps between 14 and 16 A. D., from allusion to the case of Libo. There follow five excursuses.

XII, pp. 205-214. Fr. Susemihl. Zum zweiten Theile des Parmenides. His system of the universe (p. 212) consisted of (1) dark firmament, (2) upper rim of fire = ether with all the stars, (3) miscellaneous hollow spheres (*a*) sun (*b*) milky way (*c*) moon; (4) and (5) lower double rim.

XIII, pp. 215-223. H. Weber. Zu der Schrift *περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἡερικῆς*. Part III (continued from Philol. LVI, 230-243. Discussion of (1) p. 24, 5 ff. K. (2) p. 24, 14-16 K. (3) The writer differentiates his science from that of the physicists and sophists who were natural philosophers.

XIV, pp. 224-251. K. Lincke. Xenophons Hieron und Demetrios von Phaleron. This dialogue appears not to have been written by X.; it is a fruit of the dekaetia. P. 232: "The free Athenians, who were so jealous of their freedom, were to be shown that they were practically throwing themselves into the arms of a single leader of the state, and surrendering their freedom to him." Demetrios was probably meant. The question of the happiness of the tyrannos is only secondary.

XV, pp. 252-257. K. Praechter. Die Berner Handschrift der Anacharsisbriefe. Collation of (B) Cod. Bern. 579 saec. XIV. chart. fol. 28 r. B and *a* represent one, P and L another branch of a tradition from the common archetype. Two conjectures are added.

XVI, pp. 258-265. A. Hausrath. Ad Babrii editionem novissimam additamenta duo. Gleanings from Cod. Cryptoferrat. 27, and Vat. Graec. 949.

XVII, pp. 266-280. J. B. Mayor. Notulae Criticae in Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticum, with a few foot-notes by Dr. O. Stählin.

XVIII, pp. 281-303. P. de Winterfeld. Observationes Criticae (1) Avienus (8 notes). (2) The Precationes of cod. Leid. Voss. Q. 9. (3) Aenigmata Tullii. (4) Correction to interlinear glosses of the cod. Pith. of Juvenal (ed. E. Lommatzsch). (5) Florus' verses to Hadrian. (6) Firm. Matern. p. 3, 28 f. (7) Hist. Apoll. Tyr. cap. 22, p. 41, 3R². (8) The words *pisum* and *Neptunius heros*. (9) Riese Anthol. I, p. 85, v. 66. (10) Dicta Catonis II 3, and (11) lomentum.

P. 303. H. Deiter. Zu Cic. de nat. deor. I 1.

XIX, pp. 304-311. H. Blümner. Kritische Bemerkungen zu Ovids *Ars Amatoria*, 10 notes.

P. 311. G. Landgraf. *Caes. bell. Gall. V. 50. 3* reads 'ut exploratis etc.', or 'at ut etc.'

Miscellen.—Pp. 312-320. 5, pp. 312-314. R. Koellner. Bemerkungen zu den Papyrusfragmenten des platonischen Laches.

6, pp. 314-316. L. Radermacher. Zu Isyllos von Epidauros.

7, pp. 316-318. W. Drexler. Zu Philo de posteritate Caini §161. The emendation *ιεράκων* for *δορκάδων* is wrong, (Philol. LVII 280). The gazelle was considered sharp-sighted.

8, pp. 318-319. J. Ziehen. Zur Kunstmythologie des Adonis. *Carm. contra paganos* vv. 17 ff. describe a picture.

9, pp. 319-320. J. Ziehen. Zur Kultgeschichte des Fackelwettkaufs. The statues of the city goddesses, Byzantium and Alexandria, had Cupids bearing torches, while Roma and Treves were without them. This is perhaps due to the prominence of the lampodromia in the Greek worship and its absence in the Roman.

XX, pp. 321-342. B. Heisterbergk. *Solum Italicum*. An exclusively legal expression denoting the territory of the Roman possessions, the opposite of *solum provinciale*, which last includes in the legal sense every thing which is liable to taxation.

XXI, pp. 343-347. A. Mommsen. 'Pákos auf attischen Inschriften. The word refers to garments offered to Artemis Brauronia by Athenian maidens after the first menstruation.

XXII, pp. 348-361. H. Jurenka. Pindars sechstes nemeisches Siegeslied. Based on his review of Christ's edition, *Z. f. ö. G.* 1897, p. 1071-1086, and he draws on Bacchylides for illustrative material. Verse 31 refers to the Aiacidæ from whom the Bassidæ were descended—a race celebrated of yore, which adds to the fame of its progenitors its own glory, i. e. the glory of the later and living descendants.

XXIII, pp. 362-400. W. Nestle. Die Bacchen des Euripides, pp. 399-400 summarize the conclusions. Eur. himself speaks by the mouth of the aged Cadmus and Tiresias. The prevailing view that the Bacchæ occupies a place by itself among his works, especially because it signifies a recantation of philosophical opinions expressed by the poet elsewhere, is untenable. It is unlikely that Euripides was converted between the seventy-second and seventy-fourth year of his age to the old faith in the gods. Similar passages for such a recantation might have been cited from the *Supplikes* and *Ion*. The hero, Pentheus opposes the cult of Dionysos from *ἵβρις*. Euripides through Cadmus and Tiresias emphasizes his own view that *σωφροσύνη* and *σοφία* are not incapable of being united with the Bacchic *ἐνθουσιασμός*.

XXIV, pp. 401-406. O. Immisch. Babriana, ad Ottonem Crusium. Notes on fab. 25 and 1 and the prooemium.

XXV, pp. 407-421. R. Fuchs. *Anecdota Hippocratea*. Die *Epistula Vindiciani ad Gaium* (oder *Pentadium*) *nepotem suum* und der *codex Dresdensis Dc.* 185.

XXVI, pp. 422-436. Fr. Reuss. Zu *Valerius Flaccus Argon.* I-IV. *Conjectures*.

XXVII, pp. 437-450. K. Niemeyer. Zu *Seneca*, 23 critical and exegetical notes on the dialogues and epistles.

XXVIII, pp. 451-466. S. Eitrem. *Observationes mythologicae maxime ad Ovidium spectantes*. (1) The Io-myth (a) the form in *Callimachus* (b) in *Ovid*. (2) *Phaethon*. (3) *Atalanta*. (4) The Etruscan pirates.

Miscellen.—Pp. 467-480. 10, pp. 467-9. P. Kretschmer. Eine theräische Felsinschrift.

11, pp. 469-472. R. Peppmüller. Zu *Demosthenes de corona*, 289. Reads in the epigram on the warriors who fell at *Chairo-neia*: v. 3 ἀρετῇ καὶ ἀδείμαντοι. v. 5 μὴ (ἐπὶ) ζυγόν. v. 8. ὅστέ' ἐπέει.

12, pp. 472-3. G. Lehnert: Zum *Cyclops* des *Euripides* reads σούς for τοὺς (288).

13, pp. 473-4. K. Praechter. Ein unbeachtetes *Herakleitos*-fragment. In the scholia to *Epictetus* of the cod. Bodl. gr. misc. 251 fol. 157a, in *Schenk*'s ed. p. LXXI ff. is the note 'Ἡρακλείτου' ψυχὰ ἀρηίφατοι καθαρώτεραι ἢ ἐνὶ νοῦσοις. It does not come directly from *Her.* περὶ φύσεως but a later metrical version. With it is to be compared fr. 102 (Byw.).

14, pp. 474-6. R. Helm. De *Hecales Callimacheae* in *Latium conversae* fragmento. In *Fulg.* p. 180 (ed. *Muncker*) ientaculum inferre *Iovi*.

15, pp. 476-7. E. Goebel. Kritische und exegetische Beiträge zu *Cic. Tuskulanen*, 21 V. 78, 22 V. 113.

16, pp. 477-8. H. Fischer. H. Kurz über *Lucans Pharsalia*. In a letter to *Mörike* Sept. 1838, the poet K. wrote of the verse 'Victrix causa diis placuit, sed victa Catoni,' "Ist das nun nicht ganz französisch? Ein grosser Witz, aber doch klein und nur frivol."

17, pp. 479-480. O. Cr. Zur Würdigung der Exkurse bei den antiken Prosaikern. Notes of our modern type were avoided by the ancients not for artistic considerations but because the ancient writer thought of the oral reading of his work.

18, p. 180. M. Petschenig. Zu *Corippus Ioh.* I. 32.

XXIX, pp. 481-497. P. Hartwig. Eine *Aretinische Gefässform* mit *Scenen* aus der *Phaethonsage*—with one plate. Description of a vase in the *Boston Museum of Fine Arts*, No. 63, p. 89 of *Annual Report XIII*. It came from the workshop of *Perennius* from the hand of *Bargates* in the first century B. C.

XXX, pp. 498-502. H. Vysoký. *Epigraphische Kleinigkeiten*. I. Zum *Tragiker Arcestratos*. II. Zu den *dodonäischen Orakelinschriften*.

XXXI, pp. 503-552. W. Kolbe. De Atheniensium re navali quaestiones selectae. 1. Quomodo Atheniensium res maritimae usque ad 376 creverint atque deminutae sint. II. Quomodo res navalis administrata sit. a) De superiorum temporum ratione. b) De quinti saeculi ratione administrandi. 1. De magistratibus. 2. De trierarchia. 3. De nautarum stipendio et comiteatu.

XXXII, pp. 553-557. E. Lange. Noch einmal der Anfang des peloponnesischen Krieges. A rejoinder to Dammann's article in *Philol.* LVIII, pp. 132-147. He is certain that Thucydides himself considered the surprise of Plataeae as the beginning of the war.

XXXIII, pp. 558-576. W. Soltau. Ein chronologisches Fragment der Oxyrhynchos-Papyri (I Series, No. XII) Summary p. 576: The writer made use of a late chronographer who without possessing a thorough and minute knowledge of Greek and Roman history faithfully copied and 'contaminated' his sources: a man who, though he had respect for the data of Varro and Nepos, did not dare to use them when they seemed to contradict the usual statements of the Greek historians. A Greek Table was the basis, to which he added from a compendium which contained extracts from Varro, Nepos and another annalistic source.

XXXIV, pp. 577-593. O. Crusius. Pigres und die Batrachomyomachie bei Plutarch. 1. Plutarch could have used Ptolemaios Chennos. 2. The clause about Pigres in Herod. IX 52, came into the text from a marginal note, which pushed out the original. 3. The source of Plut. Sulla 36 is Ptolemaios Chennos. 4. The form 'batrachomyomachia' is the best attested and also the oldest.

XXXV, pp. 594-616. W. Drexler. Alte Beschwörungsformeln. 1. Byzantine incantation of the *ιστέρα* and an Italian prayer against the male del fianco e di matrone. 2. A magic formula of Marcellus of Bordeaux on rings. 3. Notes on Kyranis II στ. ζ §8, 9. on the use of the lizard for disease of the eye.

XXXVI, pp. 617-620. H. Weber. Plautina. Notes on Amph. 291 ffg. 930, Asin., 631, Curc. 256 ffg.

Miscellen.—Pp. 621-632. 19, p. 621. G. Knaack. Zu den Kultstätten des Asklepios. (*Supplem. to Philol.* LIII 756.)

20, pp. 622-4. H. Lucas. Die Herkunft Bions und Horazens. Note on the Vita Horati "quotiens ego vidi patrem tuum brachio se emungentem!" A proverbial expression.

21, pp. 624-627. R. Fuchs. Pseudhippocrates, Epid. VI. 1, cap. 9.

22, pp. 627-628. P. de Winterfeld. Ad Ciceronem et Hyginum. In Cic. de or. I, 29, 132 after decere, read quod < facias; quod >. In Hyg. Astron. II, 5, read patefaceret for satisfaceret.

23, pp. 628-632. A. Frederking. Zu Ciceros Briefen. Indices, etc.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

BRIEF MENTION.

A mischievous writer in a recent number of the *Revue Critique* says that the ever-increasing tendency to publish editions with translations will bring with it greater confidence in the editors whose commentaries often lead one to suspect that they do not understand their texts. In DIELS's *Herakleitos von Ephesos (Griechisch und Deutsch)*, (Berlin, Weidmann) the German version was not needed to show the editor's thorough adequacy, and the German press has congratulated the translator on the artistic skill with which he has caught the oracular tone of Nietzsche's 'Also Sprach Zarathustra'. But what interests me personally even more than the admirable rendering is the preface in which DIELS gives expression to a view which I have long entertained but have never had the courage to advocate. 'The philosophy of Herakleitos the Obscure is by no means so obscure', says DIELS, 'as is the unanimous plaint of ancient and modern times', and, himself an editor of Parmenides, he adds that Herakleitos is obscure in the form only, Parmenides is opaque in content also. As to the sense, as to the reach of his ideas, Herakleitos is perfectly clear, whereas Parmenides never succeeded in working himself out into perfect clearness even to his own mind. Herakleitos surrounds his ripe fruit with a protective envelope, so that it may not fall into the hands of unworthy nibblers. The wisdom of the Eleatic abides still in the bud and awaits the bright sunshine for its full unfolding. The system of Parmenides has evoked a development; Herakleitos, whose system was complete, has found imitators of every degree of slavishness but no real successor.

The far-famed Herakleitean obscurity, continues DIELS, lies only in the style, and the question whether this obscurity is designed or no is not so easy to answer. He himself refers to the prophecy of Apollo and the voices of the Sibyl as the patterns of his oracular style. This looks like design. But how little does an artist know of his own style and his own design. There is no domain in which the freedom of the will is more overrated than in the domain of art, especially in the art of the writer. Herakleitos fancies that his style is his own, and he is undoubtedly the most subjective, and, in a certain sense, the most modern prose writer of antiquity; and yet this highly personal style bears the stamp of a period that was ringing with the prophetic cry, Overturn, Overturn, Overturn, of a period to be compared with

that of the Reformation, of the French Revolution. Orphicism was rampant in Attica, Ionia was under the sway of Rationalism, the brother of Mysticism; and scientific investigation and rapt vision were often united in the same person, as in Anaximenes, Pythagoras and even Xenophanes. Pindar, Aischylos, Herakleitos, all show the same impress and all speak the same hieratic language. And yet this hieratic stiffness of Herakleitos is relieved by a strong immixture of subjectivity. The prophet is, as one might say, at the same time a professor; and there never was a livelier wielder of the tawse than was the atrabilarious Basileus of Ephesos.

But I will yield no longer to the temptation of summarizing the essay, which is already as compact as it well can be; and as DIELS has abandoned the obscurity of Herakleitos' style to the uncovenanted mercies of the critics, I will only say that whenever the course of my studies brings me back to Herakleitos, I have always treated him exactly as I should do Pindar and Aischylos. He is as inevitable as they and not harder nor more obscure. 'Obscure' is really not the word for him. The Latin 'tenebri-cosus' is much better. The 'malae tenebrae Orci' are full of visions, and everyone who has had to do with poets, whose darkness is not a manufactured darkness,—not the darkness with which the squid envelops itself, but the midnight of the pole,—every such student knows how the eye becomes familiar with Erebos and how figure after figure comes out to reward the intense gaze, *νυκτιλαμπεῖ κυανέῳ τε δνόφῳ ταθείς*. And after this commonplace world what a season of refreshing is the intercourse with this dervish in his midden, not on it merely. True, as one looks over the list of 137 fragments and thinks what marvels have been evoked from these oracles, all of which go into some fifteen loosely printed pages, a mere student of philosophy as literature is ashamed to let his idle fancies twist themselves round these broken pillars of the bridge which Herakleitos threw over the universe and clamber over the parapets of the *γέφυραι πολέμοιο* from which he looked down on the Eternal Flux. And yet Herakleitos is poetry and must be poetically interpreted. What if he did say that the sun has the breadth of a human foot? (fr. 3 Diels). The magnitude of the sun was a problem in those days, and the Peloponnesos, which was an exaggerated standard to most of them, seems but scant measure to us. May we not have here merely a scornful reference to the Skiapods, figures of fairy tale, mentioned by Aristophanes in his *Märchenkomödie*? To be sure, the ordinary human foot suffices to shut out the sun as does the dollar in modern times; and as the philosopher lay in his dungbath he may easily have tried the experiment. *τοῦ λόγου δὲ ἐόντος ξυνοῦ ζῶουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὥς ἰδίαν ἔχοντες φρόνησιν* (fr. 92 Byw.). What is that but a protest against the individualism that expresses itself in Pindar's *ἴδιος ἐν κοινῷ σταλείς* (O. 13, 49)? Every

commentator has noticed the coincidence between $\pi\alpha\nu \epsilon\rho\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu < \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon > \pi\lambda\eta\gamma\eta \nu\acute{\epsilon}\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (fr. 55 Byw.), a thought which survives in our 'instinct', and the $\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \pi\lambda\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu$ of the Agamemnon; and I never read the oracle in which Herakleitos says that the prayers of the masses to the statues of the gods are like talking to a dead wall without thinking of $\delta\mu\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\nu \delta' \acute{\epsilon}\nu \acute{\alpha}\chi\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\iota\varsigma \mid \acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\epsilon\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma' \text{'}\acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\omicron\delta\iota\tau\alpha$. 'Without vision the people perish'. $\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma \alpha\iota \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota$ (fr. 34 Byw.) is Sappho's $\acute{\Phi}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\epsilon \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; and finally $\tau\acute{\alpha} \delta\acute{\epsilon} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha \omicron\iota\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota \kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\nu\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ (fr. 28 Byw.) recalls Shelley's 'Cloud' with its 'Lightning my pilot sits'. In fact, Shelley's 'pilot' may be due to Herakleitos's steersman, for it is hard to exaggerate Shelley's love of Greek or debt to Greek. See A. J. P. XII 94, and Churton Collins's review of Rossetti's edition of Shelley's *Adonais* in his *Ephemera Critica*.

However, I will reserve for one of those later days that may never come, my essay on the Poetry of Herakleitos; and I will only say that he that hath an ear can hear in these oracles everywhere the stately march of the dactylo-epitrite if one dare speak of dactylo-epitrites in the existing chaos of metre. But before leaving the fascinating subject of Herakleitos, I can not forbear to add an odd illustration of the danger of hasty criticism, the danger that the emitter of *Brief Mentions* himself runs every quarter. Some dozen years ago or more there appeared an American rendering of Herakleitos with an elaborate introduction. The book was promptly reviewed by an eminent Scottish Hellenist, who proceeded to point out sundry mistakes, which he considered elementary. Some of them were elementary, some incomprehensible; and as the translator was not a professed Grecian, he had to take his gruel, if I may use a bit of brutal British slang. But the gruel was Scottish gruel and in comparing the passages criticised with the new version, it seems to me that I can discern the influence of locality on the critic. So, for instance, my compatriot rendered the famous fragment (46 Byw.): $\tau\acute{o} \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\xi\omicron\upsilon\nu \sigma\upsilon\mu\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ 'The unlike is joined together' the general sense of which is not so very far from DIELS's version: 'Das auseinander Strebende vereinigt sich', whereas the critic's translation 'Counter-irritation is helpful' is singularly out of keeping with the context and suggests nothing so much as the *milieu* of the Scotch fiddle and the scratching post.

It is not a little remarkable that, despite the activity developed by American classical scholars during the last quarter of a century, American contributions to conjectural criticism have been so few. This appeal from MSS that we have to a MS that has been lost does not seem to exercise the same fascination on the American as on the European mind. Of course, our German friends, our

German masters, would have a ready explanation. The American is a practical creature and as he knows that the margin of success is very small, that the public on which he wishes to unload his conjectural stock is very cool, and that editors very often fail to list the offerings that are made, it is not surprising that your practical American—we are all practical Americans—turns his attention to other fields of speculation. But this is only one aspect of the case. It can hardly be the sole explanation; and there are those who regard the scantiness of our conjectural work as a sign of philological nonage. For conjectural criticism demands the highest faculties. One must not only be master of all the possibilities and all the probabilities, every shade of vocabulary, every propriety of syntax, the period of the language, the sphere of the author, his thought, his habits. There must be added to all this the gift of insight that no apparatus however elaborate can replace. Otherwise conjectures are random guesses, which are so many impertinences to the busy mortals who are trying to understand their texts. Of course, a fair knowledge of the language and a certain palaeographic vision will suffice for a modest line of emendation; and every hour of the twenty-four some obscure proof-reader in some back room of a newspaper office is making corrections which would be classed among the *palmares emendationes*, if they were published in the critical apparatus of a Greek or Latin text. Not to be too personal, the peculiar character of my own handwriting forces on me problems of this sort every few days especially 'on a forgotten matter.' So in A. J. P. XXIII 20, l. 17 fr. top, the printed page shows 'in case of verbs.' On reading the passage over carefully, after it was too late, I emended 'verbs' into 'doubt' and my conjecture was confirmed by a careful examination of the *ductus litterarum* of the original. The only inference to be drawn from this is that we have not the same native familiarity with Latin and Greek that we have with English. Or else so much ado would not be made about very simple matters. On Persius 3, 29 Heinrich suggested in 1844 for *ve tuum* the reading *vetulum*. It seems too easy to be true. Nor is the sense perfectly satisfactory: 'old cock of a censor.' Still it is a way out of a grammatical difficulty. In the Classical Review for March 1888, p. 85, Mr. Stanwell makes the same suggestion, on which I did not fail to comment, A. J. P. IX 126. And yet in the Classical Review for June of this year (p. 283) the editor, who is also the editor of a Corpus Poetarum Latinorum and an eminent scholar, divides the prize for 'the correction' between Messrs. A. C. Clark, A. B. Cook and A. B. Keith, carefully arranged in alphabetical order. And now comes in the July number Mr. J. U. Powell and claims the correction as original with Mr. Stanwell.

Now it is to me a thing incomprehensible that scholars should be so enthusiastic about the credit of such minuscule affairs,

still more incomprehensible that they should rush into print without a decent examination of the critical apparatus. But the higher work of the conjectural critic is another matter and I only regret that much of it is not done in this country. Unfortunately when articles in this line are offered to me, I am often forced by pressure of matter to postpone publication with the almost invariable result that after a few weeks the enthusiastic author is as eager to withdraw his conjecture as he was to advance it. But one elaborate reconstruction of a famous passage has been in my editorial drawer for a considerable time, and while I cannot reproduce the whole, I must no longer withhold the 'evident correction.' The thing is done *secundum artem*. The text, as it stands, is torn to pieces and there is a long and learned disquisition on the mosquito in antiquity and the cryptic use of the *culex anopheles* in Greek poetry, all which I must suppress. The passage is found in Aischylos, Ag. 965 and runs in Wecklein's ed. thus:

τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπέδως
 δεῖμα προστατήριον
 καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται,
 μαντιπολεῖ δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά;

The chorus is commenting on the language of Klytaimestra, in the half-echoing way that choruses have. Klytaimestra had said v. 882:

ἐν δ' ὀνείρασιν
 λεπταῖς ὑπαὶ κώνωπος ἐξηγειρόμην
 ῥιπαῖσι θωύσσοντος,

and with these words in mind the chorus utters the distressful chant:

τίπτε μοι τόδ' ἐμπίδων
 δῆγμα¹ προσστικτήριον
 καρδίας τερασκόπου ποτᾶται.

The changes are very simple, the sense penetratingly appropriate. There is no contradiction such as we have between *ἐμπέδως*, *προστατήριον* and *ποτᾶται*; the fact that *προσστικτήριον* is not in the lexica ought to count in its favor and no one who has heard the buzz of the New Jersey *culex* can fail to appreciate the propriety of *μαντιπολεῖ* (*νυκτιπολεῖ*?) *δ' ἀκέλευστος ἄμισθος ἀοιδά* in this new setting.

The first part of CARL WUNDERER'S *Polybios-Forschungen* (Leipzig, Dietrichsche Buchhandlung) had to do with *Proverbs and Proverbial Turns in Polybios*. It is an interesting contribution to the study of the great historian, great despite his limitations; and the second part, *Citata und geflügelte Worte bei Polybios*, is not less interesting and is even more important, more important for the

¹ Anticipated by Stephanus.—B. L. G.

appreciation of Polybios and more important for our own comfort. With all the wealth of Greek literature at his command, Polybios was less penetrated by its spirit than we poor moderns. Hesiod, Epicharmos, Simonides, Pindar were known to him, according to WUNDERER, only by their *ἔπεα πτερόεντα*. Alkaios, Sappho, Anakreon, he either did not know or ignored; and WUNDERER thinks that Polybios showed all that he knew. Of the dramatists the old masters Aischylos and Sophokles exercised no influence on his aesthetic views of the character of the tragedy. The thoughts of Euripides, who dominated the Hellenistic age, are readily recognized in the historian but the wise sayings of the tragic poet were the common property of the Greek people, and quotations and allusions no more prove the study of the drama as drama, than the use of Biblical texts proves actual familiarity with the passages *in situ*. Homer is still the poet *κατ' ἐξοχήν* and Polybios finds it necessary to bring up the Homeric Question. But the quotations are all trite, and while the Stoic ideal of Odysseus may have comforted, encouraged and instructed the historian in practical life and while he may have found guidance in the oracle of Homeric wisdom, Polybios had only the current knowledge of the Homeric poems and they exercised no deeper influence on the aesthetic and moral training of the historian.

This unliterary or non-literary character of Polybios' history is to be explained, says WUNDERER, by the personality of the writer and the trend of his time. Here and there a vivid description is to be found in Polybios but his light is for the most part a *siccum lumen*. He despised the rhetoricians; and the rhetoricians of a later day—witness Dionysios—returned the compliment in the name of the guild. In fact, he learned to value the treasures of his own literature only when he saw how the Romans valued them. His training had been a practical one and his affinities were with the Stoics, who prized poetry for its ethical contents solely. The religious basis of morality was gone and the poet had taken the place of the prophet and the priest. But this 'verhängnisvolle Wirkung' of the Stoics, of which WUNDERER speaks, is quite in line with the original Greek conception of the office of poetry. The didactic function of the poet, it is not too much to say, was always present to the Greek mind. We repeat after Horace 'miscuit utile dulci' but we must remember that in the beginning the Greek poured wine into the water and not the other way. But the subject is a large one and cannot be developed here. Suffice it to say that WUNDERER's new study helps to reconcile the Greek scholar to the oncoming of Rome. It was time for the Roman to take up the lamp that the Greek splinter (Ar., V. 249) had failed to quicken into light and life. One of the greatest debts we owe the Roman is the victory of the earlier and healthier Greek literature over the later growth. (A. J. P. XIX 115.)

NECROLOGY.

ALFRED WILLIAM STRATTON.

American scholars, especially of the younger generation, as well as his many warm friends in Canada and the United States, have heard or read, with a great shock, of the recent death of Professor ALFRED WILLIAM STRATTON in India. He died at the early age of 38, at Gulmarg in Kashmir, on the 23d of August of the present year. With him comes to an end one of the most hopeful, interesting and useful careers ever entered upon by an American scholar.

Professor Stratton was a Canadian by birth, was graduated in 1887 in the University of Toronto, and for some years after taught the classics in the Hamilton Collegiate Institute. In 1892 he came to the Johns Hopkins University as a student of Sanskrit and Comparative Philology, was appointed Fellow in 1893, and promoted to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in 1895. As he entered these studies through the door of the Classics his dissertation occupied middle ground between Greek and Comparative Philology. He felt induced very early in his studies to collect on a scale as exhaustive as possible, the materials for a complete history of Greek noun-formation, in other words, the history of the Greek noun-suffixes. The dissertation which he presented, 'the first of a series of papers in which I hope to present an account of the history of noun-formation in Greek', dealt with the most important *m*- suffixes (*-mo-*, *-meno-*, *-men-*, and *-mno-*); it was published in the second volume of the University of Chicago Series, entitled *Studies in Classical Philology* (1899, vol. ii, pp. 115-243). The little book made its mark: it is by far the most exhaustive and penetrating treatment of a chapter in Greek noun-formation that has yet been made. A complete history of the whole subject along Stratton's lines of research would be an invaluable contribution to the history of Greek grammar, as well as to the Comparative Grammar of the Indo-European languages.

Soon after taking his degree he was appointed Assistant and later Associate in Sanskrit at the University of Chicago; there he remained, a successful teacher and investigator, until the year 1899.

At that time the combined position of Principal of the Oriental College at Lahore and Registrar of the Panjab University became vacant. The incumbent of that position, the famous Indologist, M. A. Stein, had accepted the post of Principal of the Madrassah in Calcutta: I was called upon to suggest a successor. It was pleasant to be able to recommend without the least reserve such a man as Dr. Stratton; he was duly appointed to the difficult, responsible, and rewardful post. The duties of the position were to administer the affairs of higher education in the Panjab, and at the same time to manage the Oriental College of the University and to lecture on Sanskrit and Comparative Philology. With characteristic breadth and thoroughness Stratton set about to meet the needs of his offices. The teachers of the Oriental College are all natives, the students very largely so. It was necessary to converse fluently in Sanskrit with the Pandits, and to be able to lecture in Hindustani or Urdu, the *lingua franca* of North-India. At the time of his death these things had ceased to be problems for Stratton; and the ardent labor and close application necessary for such accomplishments may readily be imagined, considering that he was during the same time what we should call the President of the entire Panjab University.

Large plans for ultimate researches were not wanting during these brief years. At the Johns Hopkins University he had conceived the plan of an exhaustive bibliography of the Upaniṣads. These highly interesting theosophic treatises, indefinitely numerous in their variety and nomenclature, published singly and in collections both in India and in Europe, required the ordering hand of a sound scholar. This work was continued in Chicago and the ultimate completion of it seemed secure. North-India is the home of the Vedic school of the Kāṭhas and Stratton's studies led him constantly to the search of materials for the ultimate publication of the Sūtras of this school. A good paper of an archaeological character, on a recently excavated sculpture of the Buddhist goddess Hārītī was read at the last meeting, in April 1902, of the American Oriental Society and will be published in the forthcoming volume of its Journal.

In July of the present year he left Lahore for his vacation in

Kashmir; he appeared to be well, though overworked and weakened by the heat of the North-Indian summer, the hottest summer of any civilized country. The second day after reaching the mountains he fell ill of Malta fever, died, and was buried at Gulmarg. His wife was with him until the end came: there are no children.

Indian science has lost through his death one of its most promising workers; those who knew him best a friend and companion of singular attractiveness of character. He was destined to become a large scholar, but without the least accompanying touch of self-seeking or aggressiveness. Gentle, amiable, and devoted, he will be remembered, I think, with affection and admiration by every one who knew him in the course of his brief but varied career.

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Bechtel (E. A.) *Sanctae Silviae peregrinatio*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1902. 3-160 pp. (University of Chicago studies in classical philology) pap., net, \$1.

Burgess (Theodore Chalon). *Epideictic literature*. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1902. 2+89-261 pp. 8vo (University of Chicago studies in classical philology) pap., net, \$1.

Goodell (T. Dwight). *A school grammar of Attic Greek*. New York, *Appleton*, 1902. 16+334 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.20.

Jastrow (Morris, Jr.) *Dictionary of the Targumin, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi and the Midrashic literature*. Pts. 8-14. New York, *Putnam*, 1902. 4to, pap., subs., each, \$2.

Stevenson (J. H.) *Assyrian and Babylonian contracts, with Aramaic reference notes*. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902. 206 pp. 12mo (Vanderbilt Oriental ser.), cl., \$1.

Studies in classical philology. V. 3. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1902. 4+261 pp. Bds., net, \$1.50.

Contents: Papyri from Karanis; The use of repetition in Latin to secure emphasis, intensity and distinctness of impression, by Frank Frost Abbott; Epideictic literature, by T. C. Burgess.

Vergil (Maro Publius). *Aeneid*. Bks. 1-6. With introduction, notes and vocabulary by H. S. Frieze; rev. by Walter Dennison. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902. c. 180+198+221 pp., il. 12mo, hf. leath., \$1.30.

Xenophon. *Cyropaedia*, bk. 1. With introduction and notes founded on those of H. A. Holden, and a complete vocabulary by E. S. Shuckburgh. New York, *Macmillan*, 1902. 20+156 pp. 12 mo, cl., net, 60c.

ENGLISH.

Andrew (S. O.) *Greek Versions of Greek Prose Composition*. London, 1902. 8vo. 5s.

Gray (L. H.) *Indo-Iranian Phonology, with special Reference to the Middle and New-Indo-Iranian Languages*. London, 1902. 8vo. 12s. 6d.

Oman (C.) *Seven Roman Statesmen of the later Republic: The Gracchi, Sulla, Crassus, Cato, Pompey, Caesar*. London, 1902. 8vo. 356 pp., il., 6s.

Schuyler (M.) *Index Verborum of the Fragments of the Avesta*. London, 1902. 8vo. 8s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Bérard (V.) Les Phéniciens et l'Odyssée. Tome I. Paris, 1902. 8vo. 592 pp. Avec cartes et grav. 25 fr.

Cucheval (V.) Cicéron orateur. 2 vols. Paris, 1902. 18mo. 7 fr.

GERMAN.

Abhandlungen, Breslauer philologische. Hrsg. v. Prof. Rich. Förster. IX. Bd. 1. Hft. gr. 8. Breslau, *M. & H. Marcus*.

1. Mikolajczak, Josephatus: De septem sapientium fabulis quaestiones selectae. Accedit epimetrum de Maeandrio sive Leandro rerum scriptore. v, 75 S. 1902. m. 3.

Barth (J.) Wurzeluntersuchungen zum hebräischen u. aramäischen Lexicon. iv, 61 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 4.

Bechtel (F.) Die attischen Frauennamen nach ihrem Systeme dargestellt. viii, 144 S. gr. 8. Göttingen, 1902, *Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht*. m. 5.

Braune (Wilh.) Althochdeutsches Lesebuch. Zusammengestellt u. m. Glossar versehen. 5. Aufl. viii, 258 S. gr. 8. Halle, 1902, *M. Niemeyer*. m. 5.

Franke (R. Otto). Pāli u. Sanskrit in ihrem historischen u. geographischen Verhältnis auf Grund der Inschriften u. Münzen dargestellt. vi, 176 S. gr. 8. Strassburg, 1902, *K. J. Trübner*. m. 6.

Goetz (G.) C. Maecenas. Rede. 30 S. gr. 4. Jena, 1902, *G. Neuenhahn*. m. 1.60.

Hailer (Eduard). Beiträge zur Erklärung des poetischen Plurals bei den römischen Elegikern. Progr. 28 S. gr. 8. Freising, 1902. Leipzig, *Buchh. G. Fock*. m. 1.20.

Harris (M. A.) A Glossary of the Old English Gospels, Latin-Old-English, Old-English-Latin. Leipzig, 1902. 8. iii, 111 pp. m. 6.

Hesiodi carmina. Accedit Homeri et Hesiodi certamen. Recensuit Alois. Rzach. xv, 460 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 18.

Larfeld (Wilh.) Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik. 2. Bd. Die att. Inschriften. Mit 2 Taf. u. zahlreichen in den Text gedr. lith. Tabellen. 2. Hälfte. xiv u. S. 393-957. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *O. R. Reisland*. m. 36.

Magnus (Hugo). Studien zur Überlieferung u. Kritik der Metamorphosen Ovids. VI. Noch einmal Marcianus u. Neapolitanus. Progr. 66 S. gr. 4. Berlin, 1902, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.

Senecae (L. Annaei). Opera quae supersunt. Supplementum. L. Annaei Senecae ludus de morte Claudii. Epigrammata super exilio. De amissis L. Annaei Senecae libris testimonia veterum et fragmenta ex iis servata. Ad Gallionem de remediis fortuitorum liber. De paupertate. Excerpta e Seneca epistulis. De moribus lib. De formula honestae vitae lib. Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum apostolum et Pauli apostoli ad Senecam. Epitaphium Senecae. Ed. Fr. Haase. Accedit index rerum memorabilium. xi, 191 S. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.80.

Sethe (Kurt). Das ägyptische Verbum im Altägyptischen, Neuägyptischen u. Koptischen. 3. Bd. Indices. iv, 119 S. gr. 4. Leipzig, 1902, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* Complete, n. 66. m. 16.

Stenzler (Adf. Frdr.) Elementarbuch der Sanskrit-Sprache. Grammatik, Texte, Wörterbuch. 7. Aufl. Umgearb. v. Rich. Pischel. iv, 118 S. gr. 8. München, 1902, *L. Köhler*. m. 5.

Studien, Leipziger, zur classischen Philologie. Hrsg. v. H. Lipsius, C. Wachsmuth, F. Marx. 20. Bd. iii, 214 S. gr. 8. Leipzig, 1902, *S. Hirzel*. m. 10.

Taciti (P. Cornelii). De vita et moribus Cn. Jul. Agricolae liber. Erklärt v. Alfr. Gudeman. v, 117 S. m. 1 Karte. gr. 8. Berlin, 1902, *Weidmann*. m. 1.40.

Tominšek (Jos.) De compositione P. Terenti Phormionis. Progr. 24 S. gr. 8. Laibach, 1902, *Krainburg, Selbstverlag*. m. 50.

Untersuchungen, philologische, hrsg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. 16. u. 17. Hft. gr. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*.

16. Jacoby, Fel.: Apollodors Chronik. Eine Sammlg. der Fragmente. vii, 416 S. 1902. m. 14.

17. Passow, Wolff.: Studien zum Parthenon. xiii, 65 S. m. Abbildgn. 1902. m. 3.

Wijk (N. van). Der nominale Genetiv-Singular im Indogermanischen in seinem Verhältnis zum Nominativ. viii, 98 S. gr. 8. Zwolle, 1902. Leipzig, *K. F. Koehler*. m. 2.50.

Xenophontis de re equestri libellus. Recensuit Vinc. Tommasini. vii, 71 S. gr. 8. Berlin, 1902, *Weidmann*. m. 2.

ITALIAN.

Aristofane. Gli Acarnesi, versione poetica con introduzione e note di Ettore Romagnoli. Palermo. 16mo, p. 148. L. 1.

Arlia (Costantino). Passatempi filologici. Milano. 16mo, p. 323. L. 3.50.

Sanesi (Tommaso). Vocabolario italiano-greco compilato ad uso delle scuole. 3.^a ediz. con notevoli miglioramenti ed aggiunte. Pistoia. 16mo, p. 644. L. 6.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Δισχίων περὶ τῆς παραπρεσβείας. Avec une introduction et un commentaire. Par J.-M. Julien et H. L. de Pérera sous la direction de Am. Hauvette. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1902. 4 fr.

American Journal of Archaeology. Index to Volumes I-X, with an Appendix for Volume XI by V. L. Collins (Archaeological Institute of America). *Princeton University Press*, 1899.

Andrew (S. O.) Greek Prose Composition.

Greek Versions of the Greek Prose Composition. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Argive Heraeum (The). By Charles Waldstein, with the co-operation of Messrs. Chase, De Cou, Heermance, Hoppin, Lythgoe, Norton, Richardson, Tilton and Wheeler. In two volumes. Vol. I: General Introduction, Geology, Architecture, Marble Statuary and Inscriptions (Archaeological Institute of America, American School of Classical Studies at Athens). Boston and New York, *Houghton, Mifflin & Co.*, 1902.

Athalie par Jean Racine. Ed., with introduction and notes, by F. C. de Sumichrast. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Ἀθηνᾶ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος ἰά, τεύχος τρίτον. Ἀθήνησιν. 1902.

Babbitt (F. C.) A Grammar of Attic and Ionic Greek. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902.

Bayard (L.) De gerundivi et gerundii vi antiquissima et usu recentiore. (Thesis). Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*, 1902.

— Le Latin de Saint Cyprien (Thèse). Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*, 1902.

Beowulf. Translated out of the Old English by C. B. Tinker. New York, *Newson & Co.*, 1902.

Boas (Franz). Kathlamet Texts. Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology, J. W. Powell, Director. Bulletin 26. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1901.

Browder (J. B.) The Time Elements of the Oresteian Trilogy (Un. of Wisc. Thesis). (Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin, No. 62.) Madison, Wisc., July, 1902.

Drumann (W.) Geschichte Roms. Zweite Auflage herausg. von P. Groebe. Zweiter Band; Asinii-Cornificii. Berlin, *Gebr. Bornträger*, 1902. 12 m.

English Dictionary (The Oxford). Ed. by James A. H. Murray. O—ONOMASTIC (Beginning of Vol. VII). Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, 1902. \$1.20.

Euripides' Medea. Für d. Schulgebr. herausg. v. Oskar Altenburg. Mit 4 Abbildungen. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1902. geb. 1 m.

Estève (J.) Les innovations dans la tragédie grecque à l'époque d'Euripide. Paris, *Hachette et C^{ie}*, 1902.

Fiske (G. C.) The Politics of the Patrician Claudii. Reprint from Harvard Studies in Classical Philology (Vol. XIII).

Foote (Theodore C.) The Ephod: Its form and Use. J. H. U. Diss. Reprinted from the Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. XXI, Part I, 1902.

Goodell (Thomas Dwight). A School Grammar of Attic Greek. New York, *D. Appleton & Co.*, 1902.

Gray (Louis H.) Indo-Iranian Phonology, with special reference to the Middle and New Indo-Iranian Languages. By Louis H. Gray. (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series.) New York, *Columbia University Press, The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Grieb (Christoph. Fr.) Englisch-Deutsches u. Deutsch-Englisches Wörterbuch. 10. Aufl. Neubearb. u. vermehrt v. Arnold Schröer. Zweiter Band: Deutsch-Englisch. New York, *Henry Frowde*.

Gurlitt (Ludwig). Lateinische Fibel. Sexta u. Quinta. Berlin, *Wiegandt u. Grieben*, 1897-1902. @ 2 m.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, XIII. Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Haupt (Paul). Biblical Love-Ditties. A Critical Interpretation and Translation of the Song of Solomon. From the Open Court, May, 1902.

— The Hebrew term שליש (Beiträge zur Semit. Sprachwissenschaft. IV).

— The Book of Canticles. A new rhythmical translation, with restoration of the Hebrew text and explanatory and critical notes. Reprinted from American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures. Chicago, 1902.

— The phrase רכבים צמדים in 2 K. ix. 25.

— Difficult passages in the Song of Songs.

— Orakelspruch der Göttin Istar v. Arbela an König Asarhaddon von Assyrien: Aus: Marksteine aus der Weltliteratur in Originalschriften. Herausg. von Johannes Baensch-Drugulin. Leipzig, *W. Drugulin*, 1902.

Heard (W. A.) Second Greek Exercise Book, with Key, by W. G. Rutherford. London, *Macmillan & Co.* New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Heidrick (R.) Quellenbuch für den Religionsunterricht. Erster Teil. Luthers Person u. Werk. Leipzig, *Teubner*, 1902.

Hellems (Fred. B. R.) Lex de Imperio Vespasiani (Dissertationes Americanae. (Classical Philology No. 1) Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1902.

Hermes. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie. Herausg. v. F. Leo u. C. Robert. XXXVII. Bd. 3 Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.

Historical Atlas of Modern Europe. Ed. by R. L. Poore. Part XXX: containing Map 41, Germany, 1648-1795. By C. G. Robertson. Map 84, India in 1792 and 1845. By Professor Oman. Map 90, South Africa Previous to the Suppression of the Boer Republics. By G. G. Robinson. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*, MDCCCII. 3s. 6d.

Historical Sources in Schools. Report to the New England History Teachers' Association. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1902.

Judith, Phoenix and other Anglo-Saxon Poems. Transl. by J. Lesslie Hall. New York, *Silver, Burdett & Co.*, 1902.

Jurenka (Hugo). Wörterverzeichnis zu Sedlmayers Ausgewählten Gedichten des P. Ovidius Naso. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1902. geb. 1 m., 50 pf.

Lang (Henry R.) Cancioneiro Gallego-Castelhano. The extant Galician

poems of the Gallego-Castilian Lyric School (1350-1450). Collected and Edited with a Literary Study, Notes, and Glossary. I. Text, Notes, and Glossary. (Yale Bicentennial Publications). New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1902. \$3.

La Place (Marquis de). A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities. Translated by F. W. Truscott and F. L. Emory (W. Va. University). 12mo. iv + 196 pp. New York, *John Wiley & Sons*, 1902. \$2.

Lotzers (Sebastian) Schriften. Herausg. v. Alfred Goetz. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1902.

Maass (Ernst). Die Tagesgötter in Rom u. den Provinzen. Aus der Kultur des Niederganges der antiken Welt. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902. 10 m.

Mazel. By Richard Fisguill. Chicago, *Herbert S. Stone*, MCMII.

Meillet (A.) Études sur l'étymologie et le vocabulaire du vieux slave (1^{re} Partie). Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études. 139^e fascic. Paris, *Émile Bouillon*, 1902. 7 fr.

Mélanges linguistiques, offerts à M. Antoine Meillet par ses élèves. Paris, *Klincksieck*, 1902. 5 fr.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. B. Gerth. V. Jahrg., 1902. IX u. X Bandes 5. 6/7 (Doppel-Heft). Leipzig, *Teubner*.

Peppler (C. W.) Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments. J. H. U. Diss. Baltimore, *John Murphy Co.*, 1902.

Philologische Untersuchungen: Herausg. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. XVI. Heft: Apollodoros Chronik. Eine Sammlung der Fragmente von Felix Jacoby. 14 m. XVII. Heft: Studien zum Parthenon von Wolfgang Passow. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902.

Plato's Euthyphro. With Introduction and Notes by W. A. Heidel. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902.

Pratt (H. B.) Estudios criticos y aclaratorios sobre la Santa Escritura fundados en la version moderna. Tomo I. El Génesis. Nueva York, *Sociedad Americana de Tratados*, 1902.

Preud'homme (L.) Première Étude sur l'histoire du texte de Suétone De Vita Caesarum. Bruxelles, *Haysz*, 1902.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. Franz Buecheler u. Hermann Usener. (N. F.) LVII 3. Frankfurt a. M., *Sauerländer*, 1902.

Schuyler (Montgomery). Index Verborum of the Fragments of the Avesta. New York, *The Columbia University Press (The Macmillan Co.)* New York, 1901.

Schwertassek (K. A.) Schüler-Kommentar zu Sedlmayers Ausgewählten Gedichten des P. Ovidius Naso. 2te umgearb. Aufl. Leipzig, *G. Freytag*, 1902. geb. 1 m. 50 pf.

Schwyzer (Eduard). Die Weltsprachen des Altertums in ihrer geschichtlichen Stellung. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902. 1 m.

Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae. Vol. III. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit L. C. Purser. Oxonii, *E Typographeo Clarendoniano*. Novi Eboraci, *Apud Henricum Frowde*. 3s.

Stevenson (James Henry). Assyrian and Babylonian Contracts, with Aramaic reference notes. (Vanderbilt Oriental Series.) New York, *American Book Co.*, 1902.

Sturtevant (E. H.) Contraction in the case forms of the Latin *io-* and *iā-* stems, and of *deus, is* and *idem*. (U. of Chic. Diss.) Chicago, *Scott, Foresman & Co.*, 1902.

Taciti (P. Corneli) De vita et moribus Cn. Iul. Agricolaе Liber. Erkl. v. Alfred Gudeman (Haupt u. Sauppsche Sammlung). Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1902. 1 m. 40 pf.

Thomas (Cyrus). Provisional List of Linguistic Families, Languages, and Dialects of Mexico and Central America. (From the *American Anthropologist* [N. S.], Vol. 4, 1902.)

Thomas (T. W.) Das Erkenntnisprinzip bei Zwingli. Leipzig, *Hofmann*, 1902.

Vendryes (J.) De Hibernicis Vocabulis quae a Latina lingua originem duxerunt. Lutetiae Parisiorum. *Ap. C. Klincksieck*, 1902. 7 fr. 50.

Wilhelm (Adolf). An Athenian Decree. Reprinted from the *Annual of the British School at Athens*. No. VII, 1900-01.

Ein neuer Heros. Sonderabdruck aus der Festschrift für Theodor Gomperz. Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1902.

Nochmals die Bundesurkunde aus Argos. Sonder-Abdruck aus dem Rheinischen Museum für Philologie. N. F. Bd. LVI.

Inscription aus dem Peiraeus. Sonderabdruck aus den Jahresheften des österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes. Bd. V, 1902.